THE PAPERS *of the*
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

VOLUME FIFTY-FOUR SECOND QUARTER, 1960

A Mirror for Bibliographers: Duplicate Plates in Modern Printing*

By MATTHEW J. BRUCCOLI

THE noble achievements in the bibliographical study of the hand-press period have been mainly won by inference from such evidence as can be found in the books themselves. No printer of 1480 or 1580 has bequeathed to us a primer of his craft. Moxon, our earliest eyewitness, is as late as 1680; and he is often unsatisfactory—for example, on press figures.

Today, when printing is evolving so rapidly, bibliographers must not all be archeologists; some must accept the duty of recording present-day practice, both for contemporary studies and as an archive for future scholars. Unless the facts of current publishing and printing practice are organized, the bibliographers of the twenty-third century will curse us when they work on the masterpieces of this century. In all conscience, our branch of scholarship cannot study Thomas Creede's shop of 1599 and neglect the Riverside Press of 1960.

Such neglect has been rationalized mainly in two ways. First, there is the usual academic apathy toward contemporary literature, the attitude that a twentieth-century novel just isn't worth the trouble of painstaking bibliographical investigation: what does it matter if the text of a modern novel is foul? It does matter. It does matter whether

* Earlier versions of this paper were read before the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia in 1958 and the Modern Language Association of America in 1959.

one of the most delicate passages in American fiction has the correct reading *orgiastic* or the incorrect *orgastic*: "Gatsby believed in the green light, the orgiastic future that year by year recedes before us."[1] Second, it is asserted that modern technology has perfected printing—there are no more problems. And, anyway, if it isn't perfect, it is certainly so complex that a bibliographer simply can't learn enough about it. A most pernicious and false doctrine, this. Each new development in printing introduces new problems which bibliography must recognize.

I have chosen the problem of duplicate plates to illustrate my contention that the advance of bibliography can proceed only from a familiarity with trade practices. In so doing, I must also make a plea for a conservative use of bibliographical terminology, for a precise usage which relates the published text to the facts of printing.

Printing from duplicate plates is not an esoteric problem; it is standard trade practice, and a rudimentary knowledge of the use of duplicate plates is requisite for anyone—critic or bibliographer—working with machine-printed books. The bibliographical stakes involved can be high indeed. For example, when Houghton Mifflin decided to publish a new edition of *The Scarlet Letter* in 1959, the Riverside Edition—which had been kept in print since 1883, partly by the use of duplicate plates—was checked for variants. Nearly 900 were found.[2]

Virtually all trade books are printed from plates—stereotypes, electrotypes, and now plastic or rubber plates. Duplicate plates may be prepared at the outset for immediate use, or the matrices may be stored against the time when the originals wear out. Metal plates are surprisingly fragile, and shop handling or the strains of normal use frequently result in batter. Plates can be repaired, corrected, or revised by cutting out a section and replacing it with a patch of the same material. Metal plates are sometimes emended by the insertion of linotype. If the retouched plates have been used, the new material will normally print more boldly or more sharply because it has not experienced as much wear as the original section. In most cases the only method for differentiating sets of duplicate plates is by collating

[1] F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby* (New York, 1925), p. 218. For a detailed study of the text of this novel, see Bruce Harkness, "Bibliography and the Novelistic Fallacy," *Studies in Bibliography* XII, 59-74 (1959).

[2] This information was made available to me by Mr. Henry Thoma of the Houghton Mifflin Company and Mr. Harry Levin, the editor of the new edition of *The Scarlet Letter*.

copies of the book for evidence of emendation, repair, or distinguishing batter.

Oliver Steele has demonstrated that the English plates of *The Miller of Old Church* were cast from the corrected American plates.[3] The American plates contained inserted linotype corrections which, being softer than the plate metal, spread during printing. But the English plates—though they included the corrections—did not show this spreading, indicating that the English plates were cast from the corrected American plates *before* the American plates were used. By rigorously applying *edition* as all the copies of a book printed from one setting of type or from plates made from that setting, and *impression* or *printing* as all the copies of a book printed at one time without removing the type or plates from the press, it is clear that nothing more than reimpression was involved in the English and American copies of *The Miller of Old Church*. The case is clearer for Cozzens' *By Love Possessed*: after 50,000 copies were printed from flat plastic plates, curved electros were made from the original molds. Again, only reimpression is involved.

It is incorrect to apply the term *state* to the products of duplicate plates unless *within an impression* there are alterations which, in Fredson Bowers' words, "are attempts to create a form of ideal copy."[4] An example would be a stop-press plate correction made within an impression, as is the case in the first printing of *Babbitt*.[5]

If the working set of plates is revised and the stored duplicates are not, the anomalous situation of a late printing reverting to an earlier form of the text will result. This also occurred in *Babbitt*.[6] The Modern Library and Harbrace Modern Classics copies currently for sale are less corrected than certain 1922 copies—yet all these copies represent the same original setting of type.

A fascinating problem is presented by Edith Wharton's *The Children*. Plate batter repair indicates that two sets of plates were used

[3] This information was communicated to me by Mr. Steele of the University of Virginia, who is preparing a bibliography of Ellen Glasgow.

[4] Fredson Bowers, *Principles of Bibliographical Description* (Princeton, 1949), pp. 393-426.

[5] Bruccoli, "Textual Variants in Sinclair Lewis's *Babbitt*," *Studies in Bibliography* XI, 263-68 (1958).

[6] *Ibid.*

throughout the career of this novel. Perhaps Appleton was caught short by the inexplicable success of this novel and was compelled to print from two sets of plates for the sake of speed, or perhaps the Appleton and Book-of-the-Month Club copies were printed separately from duplicate plates. In any case, when the so-called third printing was required, the two sets of plates were scrambled, thereby creating two new textually indistinguishable forms of the novel. Since the Appleton code designates each of the double impressions as one single impression, what the publisher designates as the third impression actually includes the fifth and sixth impressions. Is a bibliographer to classify these as separate impressions or as two "states of a general impression?" Strictly speaking, they are separate impressions. When a publisher persists in numbering simultaneous impressions as single impressions, however, and when there is no ready way to differentiate the impressions, then it is convenient—if inaccurate—to resort to some such terminology as "states of a general impression."

Mention of the Book-of-the-Month Club introduces another problem. When the Club selects a title at present, it contracts with the original publisher for three sets of plates, which are run in three different plants. The publisher of the book will have one or more sets made for his own use. As a result, Hemingway collectors, desperate for a first-first, have been reduced to competing for a dust-jacket point in *The Old Man and the Sea*. It would be instructive to collate the four original impressions of this novel against each other and then against the three simultaneously printed impressions of the novel in *Life* magazine.

Although letterpress plates can be produced from photographs of a book, photo-offset has established itself as less expensive. If a publisher decides to reprint a work for which he does not own plates or mats from which plates can be cast, planographic duplicates of the original typesetting can be made by photographing the book itself. Since it is trade practice to use an early impression of the book as offset copy for the sake of sharpness, it is not uncommon for a late, photo-offset reprint to revert to an earlier form of the text. Moreover, since it is also common practice to mount the pages from two copies of the work for photo-copying—although a single copy can be used, it is not difficult to predict what results when one copy is from the first printing and the other is from a later revised printing. My example for the

snares of photo-offset is *The Beautiful and Damned*, which was reprinted by offset thirty-six years after it had gone out of print.[7] First the printed novel was proofread and some eighty corrections were made by pasting printed lines over the original lines before the book was photographed. Most of these corrections deal with Fitzgerald's independent system of hyphenation; and nine of the would-be corrections actually introduce fresh hyphen errors into the text. Therefore the impression of the novel currently on sale as part of a uniform edition corresponds to no authorized text; and although it reproduces the original setting of type, it introduces new errors. My preference would be to describe this as merely another impression; but more liberal bibliographers would classify this as a sub-edition, since it will probably father a new line—albeit on the wrong side of the sheets.

A related problem is simultaneous printing from standing type and from plates made from that type. This usually occurs in the production of a limited printing sold in conjunction with the regular trade printing. It is sometimes asserted that the limited or deluxe impression is printed from the type before the plates are made, but it is almost certain that in order to minimize the risk of type batter the plates are made before the deluxe impression is printed. This can be demonstrated in *Something About Eve*.[8] The subtitle in the deluxe impression reads "A Comedy of Fig-leaves," but the first trade impression has "A Comedy of Fig-Leaves." Since later trade impressions have the lower-case *l*, the title page must have been revised after the plates were made, but before the deluxe impression was printed.

Another related area is monotype. Theoretically, a monotype tape can be rerun through a type-casting machine again and again to reproduce duplicate typesettings from which plates can be made; another font of type may even be used while retaining every other characteristic of the original setting. Paper tapes are easier to store than plates or molds, and the tapes can be mailed very cheaply from one plant to another. In practice, however, there appears to be considerable variation in the use of monotype in America. Kingsport Press reports

[7] Bruccoli, "Bibliographical Notes on F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Beautiful and Damned*," *Studies in Bibliography* XIII, 258-61 (1960).

[8] Bruccoli, *Notes on the Cabell Collections at the University of Virginia* (Charlottesville, 1957), pp. 42-43.

an error factor of .28 per 1,000 ems, which necessitates thorough proofreading every time a tape is run through a caster. Plimpton Press reports no error factor.[9] There is also reason to suspect that monotype procedure varies between England and America. Futher investigation is indicated.

A useful bibliography must provide material for analysis of textual transmission; and this requires that the bibliographer have an understanding of the processes involved in perpetuating a text. It is folly to persuade ourselves that modern literature constitutes a separate bibliographical domain in which we can waive the requisite knowledge of printing practice. Yet every year vital data are squandered, lost, dissipated for want of bibliographers to preserve them. A noble end would be served by a central bibliographical agency to organize the raw materials of twentieth-century bibliography: trade periodicals, newspaper articles, advertisements, catalogues, house organs, reviews, promotional material, as well as scholarly articles. Pending the millenium, I have been clipping and filing.

[9] The Kingsport Press data is based on a letter to me from Mr. William C. Hagan, the composing room superintendent, 3 Nov. 1958; the information about Plimpton Press is based on personal interviews with composing room personnel, August 1959.

The Eighteenth-Century Forerunner of the London Library

By PAUL KAUFMAN

OF London libraries overtaken by some untimely fate and now forgotten, none better deserves restoration to its rightful place in history than the London Library Society of the eighteenth century. For it has several distinctions: it was the first library of its kind in the metropolis;[1] it was the immediate forerunner, not to say prototype, in name, as well as in kind, of one of the foremost libraries of the world today. More significant still, it was a notable focus and expression of English dissent. On any of these counts—but pre-eminently because it represented nonconformity on a distinguished level—it merits rediscovery. To present the essential surviving evidence about this institution and to interpret its significance is the purpose of the present study.

It is more than half a century since the barest mention of this library appeared in *Notes and Queries*; and a few years earlier a writer in the same periodical[2] asserted that even the two authorities on historic London, Peter Cunningham and "my friend H. B. Wheatley," had no knowledge of such an institution. Ever since these brief references the meagerness of the evidence has apparently discouraged further inquiry by chroniclers of the London scene or of library developments. Fortunately, however, the present London Library does possess the first catalogue of its forerunner, an octavo pamphlet (xx, 42 pp.):

A | CATALOGUE | of the BOOKS | of the | LONDON LIBRARY, | Instituted in the Year 1785. | London: | Printed by J. W. Galabin, Ingram-Court, | MDCCLXXXVI.

[1] That is, it was the first nonprofit subscription circulating institution. Frank Beckwith in his indispensable survey, "The Eighteenth-Century Proprietary Library in England," *Journal of Documentation* III, 81-98 (Sept. 1947), has given authority to the term "proprietary." But it has to be understood in a special sense signifying the group, or commonly designated "Society," of members or subscribers as the sole proprietors with no commercial intent.

[2] 20 Feb. 1909, p. 146, and 9 May 1896, p. 366.

Here is the beginning of the chronological framework from which we can reconstruct some of the institution's history. "Instituted" in 1785, the Society continued until at least the first decade of the nineteenth century[3] and possibly until 1817, when an entry for "London and Westminster Library, Germyn [*sic*] Street" appeared in Johnstone's directory. But the reference is baffling because of the statement in W. Carey's *Stranger's Guide through London*, 1808 (pp. 292-93) that "the Westminster Library . . . about five or six years ago [i.e. 1802 or 1803] formed a junction with the London Library." This contradiction illustrates all too perfectly various conflicting, or at least confusing, statements about the two institutions. But we can be sure of four different homes of the London Society during the sixteen years between 1785 and 1801: from the original location at 10 Ludgate Street to 11 Crane Court in 1789, back to Ludgate Street (this time at No. 5) by 1791, and then to 108 Hatton Garden in 1801.[4] Such a bare record of residence tells us little enough,[5] although the absence of the institution's name from the rate books and directories is probably telltale evidence of humble quarters, as will be detailed later. Modest surroundings and facilities are in fact adumbrated in the ill-natured, almost scurrilous disparagement expressed in a *Picture of London* [by John Feltham], 1804 (pp. 57-58):

It is a disgrace to the metropolis that it contains no Public Subscription Library,

[3] *The Monthly Magazine*, 1 July 1801, announced that the Library would reopen at the new address, 108 Hatton Garden.

[4] The Ludgate Street address is given in the *Catalogue*; and 11 Crane Court is reported in *The World*, 5 Dec. 1789. The source of the 5 Ludgate Street location is the statement in a letter of 2 June 1931 from J. L. Douthwaite, Librarian of the London Guildhall Library, to C. J. Purnell, then Sub-Librarian of the London Library: "We have a catalogue of the London Library, published in 1791, in which the Library is said to be established at 5 Ludgate Street." This valuable letter, which is attached to the *Catalogue*, provides considerable data on the addresses of the Library and the Westminster Library.

Most unfortunately the 1791 catalogue was destroyed in the last war, according to a communication from A. H. Hall, the present Librarian of the Guildhall Library. He writes that this loss "is particularly unfortunate as I am unaware of the existence of any other copy." Obviously the one known copy of the 1786 *Catalogue* thus becomes doubly precious.

[5] Rather ironically we have more separate records of the Westminster locations, from its opening in 1789 at 38 Greek Street (*World*, 4 Aug. 1789) to its last known address at 18 Air Street, Piccadilly (Post Office directory, 1823), than for the London Library. By 1810 the Westminster was at 44 Jermyn Street and is so listed in the 1811 and 1816 Post Office directories. From 1817 to the last entry in 1823 it moved three times. Our only information aside from these entries is the list of five trustees and a brief statement of aims in *The World*, 19 Feb. 1790. However, these data belong to a separate study.

on a liberal and extensive plan, similar to those which exist at Liverpool, Bristol, Birmingham, and other places. Those paltry establishments which now assume the name of Public Libraries as far as respects the practical and effectual purposes of literary accommodation, are wretchedly contemptible, and unworthy even of the small degree of patronage which they meet with.

Such violence of language in an ostensibly objective guidebook is both gratuitous and puzzling: we cannot escape the suspicion that some personal resentment dictated the outburst. We may well surmise that the conspicuous character of the new Society roused the ire of the author. They were upstart dissenters, political subversives, a dangerous lot! In any case it is regrettable that so popular a guide should have stooped so low. Happily the twenty-fourth edition edited by J. Britton, F.S.A., 1826, does not continue the libel: it contains no mention of the two libraries at all.

Turning to the more edifying content of the *Catalogue* itself, we find the prospectus of the new institution sufficiently interesting to merit rather full quotation:[6]

The want of an extensive and well chosen Public Library in the Metropolis, has long been general and just matter of complaint. Men of learning and of science, whose taste or whose profession leads them to study with peculiar attention some particular branch of knowledge, are often under the necessity of consulting works so costly and expensive, as to be far beyond the reach of most private fortunes. . . . Most of the modern publications in Natural History . . . are examples of this kind. . . .

Men of general enquiry, who seek in reading a pleasing and instructive employment . . . are also in a similar situation: and the young of both sexes too frequently suffer a depravation of morals as well as of taste, from the indiscriminate reading of common circulating libraries.

To remedy these inconveniences is the object of the institution which is now recommended to the public. It is intended that the LONDON LIBRARY shall contain all those great works in science and literature, which it is difficult for individuals to procure, as well as every other publication of taste and entertainment which has no tendency to mislead the judgment, or corrupt the heart: and as the selection of books will entirely lie with a Committee elected by the Subscribers at large, it is presumed that such a selection will be made, as will render

[6] For permission to quote freely from the *Catalogue* and its attached papers I am indebted to Mr. Stanley G. Gillam, M.A., the present Secretary and Librarian. I am especially grateful to him for his courtesy and patience in meeting my requests for varied information.

this Library particularly an object to every head of a family, who wishes to indulge those under his care in the pleasures and advantages of literature.

It is not imagined that it will be objected to the present library, that others already subsist, which render it unnecessary. For though it must be confessed that there are many public libraries which answer very well their particular purposes, yet there is certainly none entirely upon the plan here proposed. The learned libraries are not furnished with what is new even in the learned world, and contain nothing at all out of it.

If this manifesto, incisive to the point of sharpness in tone,[7] seems unduly censorious of the existing facilities of libraries of learned societies, we must realize the sense of frustration experienced by teachers and physicians reaching out for the books beyond their financial capacity. If the stiffly moralistic indictment of popular circulating libraries rather amuses us, we have to recall the puritanic element which, understandably, continued as a major factor of dissent. In fact demand for "publications of taste and entertainment which . . . do not corrupt the heart" is a thoroughly eighteenth-century attitude by no means confined to dissenters. On the whole, then, the prospectus of aims is refreshing in its earnest progressiveness. Its more specific significance is discussed later.

Much less militant is the advertisement reporting on and assessing the first year's operation. The original emphasis is confirmed in the statement that "those books which are more immediately required by the scientific reader have occupied particular attention" in making acquisitions. A further interesting announcement is of the policy to secure "original works rather than translations." But the general reader, it is affirmed, will be fully regarded through selections in belles-lettres, ancient and modern history, politics, travel, and biography. Such is the reassuring breadth of interest already practically shown and promised as a policy.

There follow the common rules for such libraries: a guinea entrance fee and a guinea a year, with regulations governing arrears, waiting lists, and the like. The selection of books from requests by members

[7] The announcements of other proprietary libraries, insofar as we have them, are less incisive and sharp, particularly about the popular libraries. For the background and a comprehensive survey of the commercial circulating libraries, see Miss H. M. Hamlyn's admirable article "Eighteenth-century Circulating Libraries in England," *The Library*, 5th Ser. I, 197-222 (Dec. 1946, Mar. 1947). I am indebted to her for a number of sources here cited, such as the early edition of Feltham's *Picture of London*.

was to be determined by a Committee of twelve; and the usual provisions are specified for annual and special meetings.

The first Committee was listed as follows:

Mr. H. Amory	Rev. Dr. Kippis	Dr. Simmons
Dr. Crawford	Dr. Lister	B. Vaughan, Esq.
Rev. Mr. Gregory	Rev. Dr. Rees	W. Vaughan, Esq.
Dr. Hamilton	Dr. Saunders	Rev. Mr. Walker

This Committee ministered to a membership of 111 men and ten women—a figure which is strikingly similar to the 132 members of the Bristol Library Society in its first year of 1773 and to the slightly increased number of 137 (of whom four were women) in 1782.[8] According to a statement in *The Monthly Magazine* of 1 July 1801, "the Society . . . has to boast of many names celebrated in the annals of literature as its founders and patrons." Although this conventional compliment was not strictly true if "literature" means belles-lettres, we shall see below the eminence of the founders.

In the main section of the *Catalogue* a total of 490 titles representing 1,188 volumes is arranged under the following classes (with the respective number of titles in each class indicated):

I.	Religion, Morality, and Metaphysics	89
II.	Anatomy, Botany, Chemistry, Mathematics, Natural History, Natural Philosophy, and Physic	190
III.	History, Chronology, Antiquities, Biography, and Heraldry	74
IV.	Law, Politics, War, Trade, and Commerce	60
V.	Astronomy, Geography, Voyages, and Travels	43
VI.	Polite Literature, Education, Language, Grammar, Rhetoric, Criticism, Logic, and Polite Arts	52
VII.	Poetry, Plays, Novels, Romances, and Miscellanies	54
	Appendix	28

These mere statistics are of course interesting,[9] although the initial

[8] The Bristol Library Society published membership lists in its printed catalogues of 1774, 1782, and 1798. See Kaufman, *The Borrowings from the Bristol Library 1773-1784: A Unique Record of Reading Vogues* (Charlottesville, Va., 1959).

[9] The first catalogue of the Bristol Library, 1774, shows 378 titles in 887 volumes, augmented by the deposit by one of the subscribers of 405 titles in 676 volumes. The first catalogue of the Leeds Library, 1778, contains 931 titles in 1,927 volumes. See Frank Beckwith, "The Beginnings of the Leeds Library" (*Thoresby Society Miscellanea* XXXVII, 3-23, 1941).

selection cannot be so significant as cumulative acquisitions over a period of years. Hence the loss of the 1791 *Catalogue* is an irreparable handicap in our study. But surveying these initial holdings, we are surprised first of all by the relative meagerness of the smallest total, that of Voyages and Travels. A fair cross section of the popular titles of the time are here: Brydone, Cook, Coxe, Dalrymple, Forster, Hanway, Hawkesworth, Moore, Pennant, Phipps, and Swinburne. But there are numerous gaps which are filled in the Bristol Catalogue of 1782. A less usual work found here (but not at Bristol) is the fourteen-volume *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses* (Paris, 1781) describing various parts of the world. "Astronomy" in the heading is satisfied by one work of Ferguson and "Geography" by one rather old work, *Construction of Maps and Globes* (1717)—or should we regard the whole group as relevant to geography?

At the other end of the quantitative spectrum, science and medicine show a surprisingly high total, although we are prepared by the preliminary announcements for a generous showing in science. As for the titles in "Physic," the large number of physicians on the Committee may well be the explanation. About these works the most interesting fact, perhaps, is that although we miss a few standard titles by contemporary English practitioners we find an extraordinarily high proportion of foreign works: no less than forty-one Latin with sixty volumes; forty-five French with sixty-nine volumes; and five German. These make a total of ninety-one out of 190 titles, or almost half; and in addition there are ten translations from various foreign languages. In this category the scattering of works in other sciences is puzzling: Buffon, Linnaeus, and Pennant—all popular in England—are there, but nothing of Priestley.

Next to this group in size—though still less than half as extensive—is Religion, Morality, and Metaphysics. Among the eighty-nine titles we see a rather conventional list unrelieved by the controversial: Clarke, Hurd, Sherlock, and two volumes only of Hume, with no Hobbes or Berkeley, but two of Priestley, several volumes of Locke, and Voltaire's *Treatise on Religious Toleration*. The older classics in philosophy are almost completely missing.

The third largest class, History, is considerably more extensive than the seventy-four titles indicate because the *Universal History* comprises

sixty volumes, thus bringing the total to 133 for this class, which includes Antiquities and Biography. Again the level is conventional: Gibbon, Robertson, Hume, Burnet, Raynall, Mosheim, and Wraxall, with very little biography or antiquities in support. Some interesting titles, however, are a nine-volume Tacitus in French, Demeunier's *L'esprit des Usages et des Coutumes des Différents Peuples* (3 v., London, 1776).

The next division in the decreasing scale, Law, Politics, War, Trade, and Commerce, with sixty titles, obviously needs the increment of the twenty-three volumes of the House of Commons *Journal*. Here again appear a few standard works in the class of law and government (the latter broadly interpreted), including Blackstone, Burns, Grotius, Hobbes, Montesquieu, Hooker, and Adam Smith. The more unusual titles are *Code Russe* (Amsterdam, 1775), Le Trosne's *L'Ordre Social* (Paris, 1777), Messance's *Sur la Population* (Paris, 1776), *Le Roy sur les Travaux qui ont rapport avec l'exploitation* (1776), and the most interesting—*Réflexions militaires, traduites de l'Espagnol du Marquis de Santa Cruz* (11 v., Paris, 1738).

The last two of the seven major classifications, which duplicate in strange fashion the various genres of belles-lettres, comprise 106 titles. But this figure is tripled to more than 300, if we count the sixty-eight duodecimos of Johnson's *Poets* (1779), the most voluminous set in the entire *Catalogue*, together with a ten-volume Sterne, a seventeen-volume Swift, a ten-volume Shakespeare, a six-volume Pope, a ten-volume Beaumont and Fletcher, a twelve-volume *English Theatre* (Lowndes, London, 1782), a nine-volume *Oeuvres de Rousseau* (Geneva, 1781), twenty-three volumes of the *Annual Register*, thirteen volumes of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, the unusual fifteen-volume *Present State of the Republic of Letters* (1735), and other multi-volume sets. Besides these, titles in the English classics are all too few: no Chaucer, Spenser, or even Milton; only the *Fables* of Dryden; five volumes of Bacon, however; Farquhar and Congreve; and in the eighteenth century, Shenstone, Gray, and Percy's *Reliques*. In fiction we have *Robinson Crusoe, Cecilia, Evelina,* and *Sandford and Merton.*

Foreign works fare at least as well: they include translations of Pindar, Demosthenes, Lucan, Cicero, Ovid, and Pliny, with a Greek Sophocles; translations of Ariosto, Rabelais, Camoens, *Don Quixote,*

Marmontel, and *Emile*; and, in the original, Molière, Racine, LaFontaine, and Voltaire.

Relatively better represented are periodicals, with runs of *The Tatler, Spectator, World, Observer, Connoisseur, Guardian, Adventurer,* and *Mirror,* and new subscriptions to *The Critical, Maty's,* and *Monthly* reviews. But patently absent are representatives of "Novels and Romances" in the heading of Class VII. In fact most of the thirteen subdivisions of these two classes, VI and VII, are only blueprints of a collection to be developed. Thus there is little or nothing to illustrate Education except Locke and *Emile*; or Language except Monboddo and Johnson's and Sheridan's dictionaries; or Grammar or Rhetoric except Blair's *Lectures*; or Logic; or Polite Arts with the possible exception of *Considérations sur les Révolutions des Arts.*

Equally obvious is the meager showing in a number of divisions of other major classes, as already noted in the case of Antiquities, Biography, and Astronomy. What is promising, however, is the acquisition of current works in all fields: sixty-nine titles were published in 1785 or 1786, or fourteen per cent of the total, while in the Appendix nine of the twenty-eight titles, or one third, bear these current dates.

Of the administration of the new enterprise we know nothing except that "attendance" was provided at its address at 10 Ludgate Street from 11 to 4 and 5 to 8 (Sundays excepted) from 25 March to 29 September and from 11 to 4 only during the other half of the year. Since a gunmaker, Henry Nock, occupied 10 Ludgate Street in 1785, the Society no doubt rented rooms over his shop as their first home. Six years later the institution had apparently progressed sufficiently to issue a new catalogue. Of this publication so tragically destroyed we know nothing except that it gave the different address, 5 Ludgate Street. Here again its home was probably over the shop of the occupant as listed in the directory—one W. Moore, goldsmith. Again silence for a longer period, ten years, broken only by a brief item in *The Monthly Magazine* of 1 July 1801 (as cited previously), announcing that the Library had moved to Charles Taylor's in Hatton Garden. There, perhaps, the institution "reopened" (in the terms of the announcement) in a corner of the engraving and publishing shop. The next sixteen years, from 1801 to the appearance of the "London & Westminster Library" in Johnstone's directory for 1817, are another

blank,[10] with the complication of the confusing statement already noted in Carey's *Guide*. With this entry in the directory, the London Library, having already lost its separate identity, disappears completely. Six years later the entry of the Westminster Library at 18 Air Street, Piccadilly (in the Post Office directory for 1823) is the end of the story for that institution.

This eclipse of two subscription or proprietary libraries within a few years is more than a mystery; it savors of the uncanny. One can readily understand the rapid rise and fall of the countless commercial book-lending shops in this period throughout England, but proprietary libraries with comparably solid foundations seldom disappeared in this fashion without trace.[11] Many of them continued into the second half of the nineteenth century when, as at Bristol, they merged into the free municipal libraries. A number like Leeds, Bradford, Hull, and Norwich happily persist to this day.

What happened to the "many names celebrated in the annals of literature" adorning the early years of the London Library Society as "its founders and patrons?" Is it not strange that no reference is found in letters, diaries, memoirs, or the press of the first half at least of the past century? Was no one moved to elegiac lament over the death of so noble an undertaking?[12] Whatever the cause of the unsolved mystery it has a sequel of great importance. Within less than a quarter of a century after the disappearance of the original library a truly distinguished group,[13] stimulated by none other than Carlyle himself, established the present institution with its 750,000 volumes, its membership of nearly 5,000, and its history of distinguished service to many thousands of scholars and general readers.

[10] It is interesting that a London and Westminster Circulating Library opened in January 1797 at 315 Holborn. Reference to the announcement thereof in *The Morning Chronicle*, 24 Dec. 1796, is given in Hamlyn, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

[11] The most important evidence regarding the growth and administration of the Society is in the brief notice of the annual meeting in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, Dec. 1796, giving the names of the Committee, now enlarged from twelve to nineteen. Three of these, Martyn, J. H. Stone, and Nares, have been cited below as prominent. Two new members, William Esdaile and Dr. Wells, were new members of the Society.

[12] In the 24th edition of *Picture of London*, 1826, ed. by J. Britton, F.S.A., no mention is made of the "Public Libraries" attacked in the 1804 edition, while Dr. Williams's Library is duly described. It seems strange that during the inauguration of the present institution in St. James's Square no one recalled the previous Society.

[13] Gladstone, Henry Hallam, Dean Milman, Sir G. C. Lewis, and other eminent men were Carlyle's associates in the undertaking organized in 1841.

However mysterious the disappearance of the earlier Society, it is the origins of this forerunner which lift it into a historic position of singular importance. For the secret of the Society's motivation appears at once from even a cursory survey of the first Committee and the life members. Of this Committee of twelve, no less than nine were prominent enough to win a place in the *DNB*. Of these nine the best known to students of literature today were the Rev. Dr. Andrew Kippis, F.R.S., F.S.A., and the Rev. Dr. Abraham Rees, of encyclopedia fame, both lecturers (or so-called tutors) at Hoxton Academy and Hackney College. The others were Dr. Sayer Walker, who began as a dissenting minister and later became a well-known physician (exactly like Dr. John Cooke, another charter member of the Society); Dr. Adair Crawford, a special friend of Priestley, who, through his own experiments in heat, inspired the latter to make some of his important discoveries in conduction; Dr. William Saunders, first president of the Royal Medical Society; Dr. Samuel F. Simmons, the foremost specialist in mental diseases, and physician to the king; the Vaughan brothers, Benjamin and William, of a wealthy West Indian family, the one a diplomat associated with Franklin and Priestley, the other a financier and humanitarian; and the Rev. Mr. George Gregory, preacher at the Foundling Hospital, active in the Royal Humane Society, and editor of *Biographia Britannica.*

Other prominent original members were the brothers John H. and William Stone; I. H. de Magellan; the Rev. Mr. Robert Nares; the Rev. Mr. Thomas Martyn, Professor of Botany at Cambridge; John Paradise, member of Dr. Johnson's club; the physicians William Woodville, John Sims, and William Hawes, a founder of the Royal Humane Society; and the most versatile and devoted leader in public health movements of the time, Dr. John C. Lettsom, a Quaker. To these must be added the redoubtable Joshua Toulmin, who had his house stoned at Taunton, and Edmund Calamy of the famous family of dissenters, a member of Lincoln's Inn and (like Kippis) a trustee of Dr. Williams's Trust.[14]

[14] An excellent historical and interpretive account is Stephen Kay Jones, *Dr. Williams and His Library* (Friends of Dr. Williams's Library, Inaugural Lecture, 1947, W. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge, 1948). What is specially significant here is that seven and a possible eighth member of the Society were trustees of the Dr. Williams's Trust, proving a close interrelationship (information in a communication from Miss Inez R. Elliott, deputy librarian of Dr. Williams's Library).

This roster of twenty-one persons of distinction can be increased to a total of about thirty in the original membership to be found in the *DNB*.[15] Obviously they are an eminent company, these first members, eight of whom as life members each paid ten guineas. Emerging too as a clear pattern is the fusion of progressive forces which make the last quarter of the century a momentous revolutionary epoch. Springing from the religious revolt against the tyrannous Act of Uniformity of 1662, one of the first organized expressions of protest was the establishment of dissenting academies which should partly continue yet greatly liberalize the tradition of university education.[16] This widespread effort (represented by over seventy schools of various levels) created the long-delayed break in the medieval curriculum through the introduction of sciences and the scientific method. It was this new and daring innovation that explains the unusual alliance between dissenting clergymen and the physicians and scientists in our library venture. By the same sign the emphasis on science in the dissenting academies is reflected in the same emphasis in the announced aims and the practice of the new Society. As seen in the table above, the 190 titles in science are twice the number in Religion and Metaphysics (87) and nearly four times the number in Poetry, Plays, etc. (54). A surprising number of the members combined in themselves the religious and scientific interests to an impressive degree, being both ministers and fellows of the Royal Society. They shared this kind of personal integration with the most noteworthy individual embodiment of combined religious and scientific leadership in the century—Joseph Priestley; and many of them also shared his political liberalism and the widening humanitarian outlook.[17]

Although Priestley himself, after the destructive riots at Fairhill,

[15] It is impossible to make positive identifications of a number of men whose first names are not given. There are also some errors, such as Edward for Edmund Calamy.

[16] The best comprehensive account of the academies is H. McLachlan, *English Education Under the Test Acts* (Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series No. LIX, Manchester University Press, 1931), which gives a wealth of statistical data of all kinds. See also Nicholas Hans, *Educational Traditions in the English-Speaking Countries* (reprinted from *The Year Book of Education*, London, [1937]) for illuminating information about educational developments.

[17] It is not contended that all of the members were either religious or political liberals. We do not know enough of several of the physicians to be sure of their allegiances in other except scientific interests. Religiously, moreover, a substantial number of members may have been Anglicans. The point is that all shades of belief could join in the project. What we do know is that the leaders were liberals on a broad front.

did not reach London until 1791, his spirit certainly animated the aims and the establishment of the new institution. He had played a leading role in starting the circulating library at Warrington; and as the first secretary (1768-69) and second president (1769-73) he gave strong impetus to the library at Leeds, which flourishes after nearly two centuries. After moving to Birmingham he wielded the influence of the Leeds example in establishing there still another of the new proprietary libraries. Observing the spread of these institutions from Leeds to Sheffield, Bradford, Hull, York, and other cities in Yorkshire, we can well credit Priestley's own assertion in 1790: "The Dissenters have always been foremost to promote these libraries."[18] He is corroborated by a chronicler of Birmingham who states that all but one of the founders of the library in that city were dissenters.[19]

This brief outline of nonconformity in significant action on the highest level affords a striking demonstration of the resourcefulness of the English people under stress in finding new channels of expression. Showing how the independent liberal spirit on four fronts—religious, educational, scientific, and politico-social—could unite in a concerted effort, this London Library obviously reflects the rapidly focussing movements of the revolutionary period. Thus even in its short life its influence, though hard to trace, may well have been considerable. For us it is an instructive reminder that the study of a single library can open perspectives of large dimensions in social and intellectual history.

[18] An exception to this pattern in its origin was the Bristol Library Society, with definite beginnings (at least in modern times) in the early seventeenth century. When the Bristol institution was reorganized in 1773 the Bishop of Bristol headed the Committee. But, as the catalogues of 1782 and 1798 show, the Rev. Mr. John Estlin, the Unitarian minister who was a friend of Coleridge and Southey, was a member of the Committee.

[19] These important references are quoted from Beckwith, *op. cit.*, p. 85*n*. I am much indebted to him for proposing the clues which have led to the development of the interpretation here offered.

Two Notes on Johnson and *The Gentleman's Magazine*

By Jacob Leed

I. *Foreign Books*

For a short time, between November 1741 and September 1743, the *Gentleman's Magazine* featured a section called "Foreign Books" in addition to the regular monthly register of "domestic" books. The titles of a selection of books published abroad were printed at length and often descriptions of the contents or short critical comments were given. In a recent article Donald J. Greene has briefly discussed the likelihood that Samuel Johnson was the editor of the Foreign Books section.[1] Greene notes that in the 1750's Johnson was interested in founding a periodical to be called "The Annals of literature, foreign as well as domestic," thus establishing (though from a later date) Johnson's interest in the kind of work represented by the Foreign Books section. "Johnson's concern to disseminate knowledge of the state of literature and learning outside England," Greene writes (p. 83), "and his intimate involvement in the editorial direction of the *GM* in the 1740's make it difficult not to believe that he played an important role in the compilation of the scholarly and intelligent 'Foreign Books' section." Greene's hypothesis is immediately attractive. Furthermore, in looking over the material to which he has called attention, several points appear in support of his hypothesis that may enable us to take Johnson's connection with the Foreign Books section not merely as an attractive possibility (the state to which Greene has brought the matter), but as a fact that can be responsibly incorporated into the account of Johnson's literary career.

The most important of these supporting points is a striking similarity between a note in the Foreign Books section for July 1742 and a passage in Johnson's "Account of the Harleian Library" (published

[1] "Some Notes on Johnson and the *Gentleman's Magazine*," *PMLA* LXXIV, 75-84 (March 1959). Greene provides a sample of Latin prose from the Foreign Books section for judgment on its resemblance to Johnson's Latin style (*GM* XII, 167); and he points out a note (*GM* XII, 223) that contains material pertinent to Johnson's "Life of Barretier."

in November 1742 and reprinted in the magazine for December). The complete note from the Foreign Books section is as follows (*GM* XII, 391):

Perhaps this Title [*Antiquitates Italicæ*], notwithstanding the Eminence of the Author, may not excite the Curiosity of many Readers, the intervening Ages between the Fall of the *Roman* Empire and the Reformation, being not often thought worthy of Attention or Enquiry. But if it be considered that by the Conquests of the *Northern* Nations the whole Face of *Europe* was changed, and that new Laws and Customs were established and new Languages produced by them, which remain at this Day among us, it will appear not useless to attend to the Customs and Transactions of those Times, from which, however they are censured for Barbarity, many excellent Laws are derived; and to examine the Manners of those Men who have at least some Right to our Regard as our Ancestors, and from this Nation a particular Title to Veneration as the Authors of our Constitution and the Fathers of Liberty.

But perhaps the want of Curiosity in some Men may be thought overbalanced by an Inquisitiveness in others too Minute and trivial by those who shall read the following Title.[2]

The similar passage from Johnson's "Account of the Harleian Library" is as follows (*GM* XII, 638):

THE Northern Nations have supplied this Collection, not only with History, but Poetry, with *Gothic* Antiquities, and *Runic* Inscriptions; which at least have this Claim to Veneration, above the Remains of the *Roman* Magnificence, that they are the Works of those Heroes, by whom the *Roman* Empire was destroyed, and which may plead, at least in this Nation, that they ought not to be neglected by those that owe to the Men whose Memories they preserve, their Constitution their Properties, and their Liberties.

Any explanation of the similarity of these passages other than that Johnson wrote both requires us to believe that Johnson would copy the idea and phrasing of such a general reflection from another writer, and that another writer for the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1742 was not only as capable and as interested as Johnson in compiling the Foreign Books section but also wrote in a style similar to his. Moreover, we know that in other instances Johnson reworked ideas that he had used previously

[2] The next title listed is of a work on medieval seals. In his "Life of Barretier" Johnson had commented unfavorably on scholars "who spend too much of their Lives upon useless Niceties" (*GM* XI, 87).

in the magazine, producing parallel passages of a comparable degree of similarity to these.[3]

The content or style of several other notes in the Foreign Books section supports the hypothesis that we are dealing with Johnson's work. The following explanatory note appears in the section for May 1742 (*GM* XII, 279):

> Xenophon Ephesius *is the Author of a Romance, nearly of the same kind with that of* Heliodorus. *He appears to have been read by* Politian, *who declares of him that his Stile is not less sweet than that of the Athenian* Xenophon; *but this work continued unprinted, till, about twelve Years ago, it was published in* Italy.

Johnson was especially well qualified to cite Politian on an obscure author, for in 1734 he had projected an edition of Politian's poems "with notes, a life of the author, and a history of Latin poetry."[4] The other notes to be particularly considered are as follows:

> The natural Curiosity of Mankind to discover what is industriously hidden from them, cannot but procure a favourable Reception to *the Art of Decifering*. (*GM* XI, 670).

> Though 3 Volumes of this great Work are already Published, we have thought it not improper to give the whole Title, for the sake of those who may not yet have heard of this Edition, and whose curiosity may justly be excited by the mention of so many illustrious Commentators. (*GM* XII, 56).

> This Collection cannot but afford a Reception proportioned to the Importance of the Art of which it is intended to discover the Original. If the Curiosity of Mankind were regulated by Reason, what Period of History would so much be studied as the Rise and Progress of the great Art of Printing?

[3] For example, the following two passages. The first is from Johnson's preface to the 1743 *GM*; the second, from his 1744 "Essay on the Importance of Fugitive Pieces" (*Works*, Oxford, 1825, V, 191). 1. "Under a Form of Government like ours, which makes almost every Man a secondary Legislator, Politicks may justly claim a more general Attention than where the People have no other Duty to practise than Obedience, and where to examine the Conduct of their Superiors, would be to disturb their own Quiet, without Advantage. . . ." 2. "The form of our government, which gives every man, that has leisure, or curiosity, or vanity, the right of inquiring into the propriety of publick measures, and, by consequence, obliges those who are intrusted with the administration of national affairs, to give an account of their conduct to almost every man who demands it, may be reasonably imagined to have occasioned innumerable pamphlets, which would never have appeared under arbitrary governments, where every man lulls himself in indolence under calamities, of which he cannot promote the redress, or thinks it prudent to conceal the uneasiness, of which he cannot complain without danger."

[4] See James L. Clifford, *Young Sam Johnson* (New York, 1955), pp. 148, 341.

This Collection contains forty seven Authors who have written professedly on this Subject, and Passages from many others, who have treated it occasionally; with five Indexes. (*GM* XII, 112).

The quotation of still more notes would strengthen the impression that, as is to be expected in the conduct of such a department of the magazine, a single hand contributed most of the comments. There is some evidence in the style that this hand was Johnson's. The word *curiosity,* for example, is used six times in the Foreign Books notes, eighteen times in the six essays by Johnson in the 1742 volume of the magazine, but only once in the December 1739 to February 1740 numbers of the magazine—numbers to which Johnson apparently contributed nothing, being absent from London.[5] The *not-improper* construction in the clause "we have thought it not improper to give the whole Title" is used in a closely similar fashion six times in Johnson's 1742 essays, but not at all in the December 1739 to February 1740 numbers. The somewhat unusual construction of the phrase "the Art of which it is intended to discover the Original" can be found in two of Johnson's known essays in the same volume of the magazine: "the remaining Part of his Life, of which it may not be improper to give a more particular Account" (p. 244); and "the Colours are laid on, of which it is not necessary to describe the Composition" (p. 353). The somewhat peculiar modification of *written* by *professedly* occurs also in Johnson's *Plan of an English Dictionary* ("books not written professedly upon particular arts," *Works,* Oxford, 1825, v, 5), and, much later, in his life of Dryden (*Works* VII, 266). Also, the manner in which attention is called to the historical epoch in which printing was invented is similar to a reference in Johnson's "Account of the Harleian Library" (*GM* XII, 638): "the Regard which was always paid . . . to that remarkable Period of Time, in which the Art of Printing was invented."

Finally, it is significant that the Foreign Books section appears less regularly (and the number of notes in it decreases) as Johnson's contribution of miscellaneous prose decreases; moreover, the section is wholly abandoned near the time when Johnson's regular employment on the magazine comes to an end. From November 1741 to July 1742 the Foreign Books section appeared in every number of the magazine

[5] See Clifford, chap. xii.

but one; during this time Johnson contributed about forty columns of prose exclusive of the parliamentary debates. From August 1742 to September 1743 the Foreign Books section appeared irregularly, being omitted from six of the fourteen numbers; during this time Johnson contributed only about ten columns of miscellaneous prose to the magazine. The September 1743 number marks the last appearance of the Foreign Books section; from that time to March 1744, when, it is generally accepted, Johnson's last parliamentary debate appeared (and when his regular employment came to an end), Johnson contributed only four columns of miscellaneous prose.

It cannot be maintained that Johnson was the sole contributor to the Foreign Books section, for at least two of the notes contain grammatical awkwardnesses that, even allowing for the pressure of haste, it seems unlikely he would stumble into.[6] But, in addition to the evidence which Greene has adduced—i.e. Johnson's interest in such compilation, his availability, and the connection between the Foreign Books notes and Johnson's "Life of Barretier"—it has been shown here that a reflection on the "Northern Nations" in the notes appears similarly phrased in Johnson's previously known writings; that the notes show a special knowledge of the literary opinion of Politian, a writer in whom Johnson was particularly interested; that the notes not only sound Johnsonian in general but also exhibit several specific points of style that are characteristic of Johnson's known writings of the time; and, finally, that the decline of the Foreign Books section coincides with the approaching end of Johnson's engagement with the magazine. What seems most probable is that Johnson was the editor of the section—that he compiled it, was the sole contributor at first, and remained the chief contributor throughout. It is often a long step down from what seems probable to what seems certain. But to take that step in the present case does not land us below the statement that Johnson contributed notes to the Foreign Books section. The connection between Johnson and the Foreign Books section that Greene has detected should be accepted as a fact, and this is a new and interesting fact about Johnson's work for the magazine during his first regular employment in London.

[6] See, for example, the notes on the Harleian Library (*GM* XII, 551) and on Martin Friewald (*GM* XIII, 448).

II. *The Art of Deciphering*

In the *Gentleman's Magazine* for December 1741, one of the books listed in the "Foreign Books" section is a work on cryptography. The Latin title is given and a felicitous editorial note follows it (*GM* XI, 670): "LEIDEN. *Davidis Arnoldi Conradi Cryptographia denudata, sive Ars deciferandi*. . . . The natural Curiosity of Mankind to discover what is industriously hidden from them, cannot but procure a favourable Reception to *the Art of Decifering*." Two numbers later (XII, 112), a note at the end of the Foreign Books section announces that the magazine will give its readers a translation of *Cryptographia denudata*. It will now be argued that Samuel Johnson (who probably edited the section in which the notice of the book and the announcement of the translation appeared) made the translation entitled "The Art of Deciphering" that followed in four installments (*GM* XII, 133-35, 185-86, 241-42, 473-75).

Almost the whole of the translation consists of short rules and instructions which bear no marks of an individual prose style; however, the single page of introduction (p. 133) sounds like Johnson's writing, as can be indicated by quoting the first two paragraphs.

THE Art of Deciphering being an abstruse Subject, on which I know not that any Treatise has ever been professedly written, I purpose in this Attempt to explain it with Accuracy and Perspicuity, and I doubt not by this Undertaking both of gratifying the Curiosity of the Inquisitive, and of convincing those of the Certainty of the Art who have hitherto questioned it. There are to be found Men of uncommon Capacity, who are ready to assert with great Confidence, that no Success is to be expected from Enquiries so doubtful and uncertain in their own Nature. There are others whose Credulity and Superstition set them almost below Mention, who pronounce no less positively, that the Interpretation of private Characters, if ever it be attained, is the effects of Magic.

The Art of Deciphering is the Practice of interpreting Writings composed of secret Characters, so that the true Sense and words of the Writer shall be exactly known. This Art, however difficult it may appear, will be admired for its Simplicity, and the Ease with which it may be attained, when the Theory of it is understood, which depends upon many certain and a few probable Propositions. The Usefulness of Arts by which suspected and dangerous Correspondences may be detected, cannot be denied, nor is it a small Incitement to the Study of it, that those who profess it are employed by Princes, in time of War particularly, and rewarded with the utmost Liberality.

The single page of translation displays several phrases that Johnson used repeatedly in his writings between 1739 and 1744: "I know not," for instance, occurs five times in the *Life of Savage*;[7] "Accuracy and Perspicuity" has several parallels;[8] and phrases similar to "gratifying the Curiosity" recur frequently.[9] Syntactical constructions that help to give Johnson's style its tone appear here ("however difficult it may appear" and "if ever it be attained"), as do single words that Johnson particularly favored. There is some objective indication that the following words and constructions from the introduction to the "Art of Deciphering" are particularly Johnsonian, for they appear more frequently in the essays of Johnson printed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1742 (a total of about thirty pages)[10] than in a body of non-Johnsonian prose almost four times as large—the December 1739, January and February 1740 numbers of the magazine (about 115 pages of prose).[11] The number of times the word or construction occurs in the thirty pages by Johnson is followed in the parenthesis by the number of times it occurs in the 115 pages not by Johnson: *perspicuity* (3,0); *be*-subjunctive (3,0); *exhibit* (7,0); *curiosity* (18,1); *credulity* (4,1); *attain* (4,1); *inquisitive* (4,2); *however* in modifying phrases and clauses (6,4); *exalted* (6,5); *hitherto* (9,5); *uncommon* (11,5). These slight individual indications that the style of the piece is Johnson's gain force when the concentration and combination of them is considered. So simple a combination as *hitherto* appearing in the same piece with *uncommon*, as it does in at least six of Johnson's short works between 1739 and 1742,[12] does not occur in any piece in the December 1739 to February 1740 numbers. Furthermore, the one-page intro-

[7] *Works* VIII, 101, 103, 114, 120, 129.

[8] "Accuracy, Perspicuity and Subtilty" (*GM* IX, 38); "Learning and Perspicuity" (XII, 206); "Usefulness and Perspicuity" (XII, 209); "Impartiality and Perspicuity" (XII, iii).

[9] "Gratify the Curiosity" (*GM* X, iv); "their Curiosity, which he gratified" (XI, 42); "gratifying his Curiosity" (XII, 208); "Curiosity which they gratified" (XII, 637); "Curiosity fail of Gratification" (XII, 638); "to gratify that curiosity" (*Works* VIII, 135); "after the curiosity of the inhabitants was gratified" (*Works* VIII, 176).

[10] "Essay on the Duchess of Marlborough"; "Life of Burman"; "Additions to the Life of Barretier"; "Essay on DuHalde's *China*"; "Life of Sydenham"; "Account of the Harleian Library."

[11] These numbers, as has been mentioned, were published when Johnson was absent from London and was not contributing to the magazine.

[12] "Life of Boerhaave"; "Life of Barretier"; "Life of Drake"; "Essay on the Duchess of Marlborough"; "Essay on DuHalde's *China*"; "Account of the Harleian Library."

duction to the "Art of Deciphering" exhibits five words *(curiosity, uncommon, hitherto, equally, easily)* which are found also in three of the six essays by Johnson in the 1742 volume of the magazine.[13] No comparable concentration appears in the December 1739 to February 1740 numbers: the twenty-four-page installment of the parliamentary debates by William Guthrie in the December number exhibits a combination of *hitherto-equally-easily*; only two other pieces have so much as a combination of two of the five items.[14] The odds seem formidable against any other writer's having used in a single page the whole set which had been used repeatedly by Johnson in other essays in the same year.

Several other words and phrases from the introduction to the "Art of Deciphering" may be mentioned. "Cannot be denied" recurs frequently in Johnson's writings, appearing five times in the *Life of Savage*, for instance,[15] whereas it appears only once in the magazine from December 1739 to February 1740. Phrases closely similar to "treasuring the Principles in Memory" occur twice in *Savage*: "treasure it in her memory" and "reflections . . . treasured up in his mind."[16] A syntactical construction that is not common in the writing in the magazine ("by which so many Artifices are practised, so many intricate Alphabets formed, and so many Expedients for Secrecy produced") can be paralleled from Johnson's writing of a few years later ("so many Schemes of Education have been projected, so many Proposals offered to the Publick, so many Schools opened for general Knowledge, and so many Lectures in particular Sciences attended").[17] A pairing of adjectives ("certain and indubitable Propositions") occurs also in Johnson's *Marmor Norfolciense* ("certain and indubitable truths").[18] Finally, the somewhat peculiar modification of *written* by *professedly* (which also appears in a note I have suggested is by Johnson in the Foreign

[13] "Essay on the Duchess of Marlborough"; "Essay on DuHalde's *China*"; "Account of the Harleian Library."

[14] "Common Sense, No. 150," *GM* IX, 640-42: *equally* and *easily*. "Memoirs of Mrs. Rowe," *GM* X, 70-72: *uncommon* and *equally*.

[15] *Works* VIII, 128, 147, 159, 182, 190.

[16] *Works* VIII, 120, 139.

[17] "Preface to the *Preceptor*" (1748) in Allen T. Hazen, *Samuel Johnson's Prefaces and Dedications* (New Haven, 1937), p. 176.

[18] *Works* VI, 98.

Books section) occurs in Johnson's *Plan of an English Dictionary* and in his life of Dryden, as already mentioned.

Whether or not Johnson translated the "Art of Deciphering," the piece is of interest to students of Johnson's work, for it probably influenced Johnson in making the well-known blunder in the "Grammar" of his *Dictionary*, where he states that the letter *H* "seldom, perhaps never, begins any but the first syllable."[19] Earlier grammars of English regularly contained comments on the individual letters of the alphabet, but, so far as I have determined, they do not include any statement about the placement of *H* in English words.[20] A statement about the placement of *H* does, however, appear in the "Art of Deciphering." Proposition 68 in the chapter on the English language states that *H* seldom occurs as the middle letter of English words (*GM* XII, 241): "The Letter *h* is rarely found in the Middle of any other Word"—that is, any other than *the*, which is mentioned in the previous proposition. Johnson's statement is not quite the same as this one. It may reasonably be conjectured, however, that Johnson remembered Proposition 68, not in its precise meaning, but as a more general statement that *H* appears near the beginning or end of words rather than at or near the middle, and that he revised it to take into account the appearance of *H* at or near the middle of such words as *without* and *birthright*. In any case, it is likely that this work, which Johnson almost certainly knew (since it was noticed in the Foreign Books section and appeared in the magazine) and which he probably translated, provided him with the idea that there is something peculiar about the placement of *H* in English words. The statement in the *Dictionary* probably is a modification of Proposition 68 of the "Art of Deciphering."

[19] "Of Consonants," "A Grammar of the English Tongue," *A Dictionary of the English Language* (London, 1755). W. P. Courtney describes the revisions of this statement in the third and fourth editions (*A Bibliography of Samuel Johnson*, Oxford, 1915, pp. 41-42).

[20] The following works do not contain such a statement: John Wallis, "Grammatica linguae anglicanae," *Opera mathematica*, Vol. III (Oxford, 1699); Willem Sewel, *A Large Dictionary, English and Dutch*, with grammars (Amsterdam, 1708); John Brightland, *A Grammar of the English Tongue* (3rd ed.; London, 1714); James Greenwood, *An Essay towards a Practical English Grammar* (2nd ed.; London, 1722); Thomas Dyche and William Pardon, *A New General English Dictionary*, with grammar (5th ed.; London, 1748); Benjamin Martin, *Institutions of Language; Containing a Physico-grammatical Essay on the English Language* (London, 1748).

The case for attributing the "Art of Deciphering" to Samuel Johnson is based on the one-page introduction to it. The introduction has the general tone of Johnson's style; it contains numerous words and phrases that were used repeatedly by Johnson and seem characteristic of his style; and it contains a combination of five words found repeatedly in Johnson's writings in the magazine in 1742, but not in any of a considerable number of pieces not by him. The evidence thus consists of matters of style only;[21] nevertheless, it seems to warrant the conclusion that the piece is by Johnson.

[21] One possibly significant point, other than matters of style, is that a footnote by the translator (*GM* XII, 133) indicates that he was someone familiar with library holdings at Oxford, as Johnson was. The translator's note corrects the opening statement that this is the first handling of the subject: "*A Treatise was written on this Subject by* B. Porta; *and a Collection of Letters written in Cipher, and deciphered by Dr.* Wallis, *are now in the Library of* Oxford."

Bibliographical Notes

The Printer of Leo I, "Sermones" (Proctor 3248)

Among the incunabula to which no printer, place, or date of printing can be assigned with certainty is a group of five editions "sine ulla nota" which have figured in the handbooks sometimes as Dutch and sometimes as German. They are the following:

Leo I: *Sermones.* fol. 140 leaves. Hain 10015. Campbell 1104. Proctor 3248. Stillwell L 114 (copies at Pierpont Morgan Library and Yale). Wislocki, Cracow Catalogue, p. 284.

Brunus, Leonardus, Aretinus: *De duobus amantibus.* 4°. 6 leaves. Gesamtkatalog 5631.

Gerson, Johannes: *De pollutionibus nocturnis et diurnis.* 4°. 34 leaves. Collijn, Stockholm Catalogue, 452.

Pius II: *Epistola ad Mahumetem.* 4°. 57 leaves. Collijn, Stockholm Catalogue, 857. Wislocki, Cracow Catalogue, p. 495.

Poggius: *Facetiarum liber.* 4°. 110 leaves. Hain *13182. Beattie, *Hand-List of Incunabula,* National Library of Scotland, second supplement (1946), p. 336.

All are printed with a single, heavy and unattractive type of 109 mm. to twenty lines, the face for the most part gothic but with an admixture of roman O, Q, S (two forms), and T, together with a few roman minuscules, including tied ct and st. As these minuscules are not found in the first three quinternions of the Leo but are normal at the end of the book, we may conclude that this was the first work, as it was much the most considerable, to be undertaken by the press.

The Leo is listed among his anonyma by Panzer, who ventured no opinion as to its origin but to whom the type was evidently distasteful (char. goth. tremulo, sculpto simil., *Annales* IV, 152, 712). Hain's unstarred entry for the Leo guesses at Anton Sorg or Conrad Fyner as the printer, a conjecture which Hain himself would doubtless have repudiated had he known the book. The catalogue of Dr. Kloss's library (1835) assigns it to the Low Countries (In Belgio, 147 $\frac{0}{2}$, no. 2586) and is therein followed by Campbell. Proctor did not altogether rule out this attribution, as some of the capital forms appeared to him "very like those of the Speculum class," but nevertheless included the Leo among the German adespota in his Index. The British Museum Catalogue, on the other hand, made it over to "Holland.—Unknown Places" without qualification (BMC., III, p. xxxiii). Dr. Collijn, in the Stockholm Catalogue, and the Gesamtkatalog, in its description of the Brunus, are again hesitant. Dr. Beattie tends to favor Germany rather than Holland.

A recent examination of the two representatives of the press which the British

Museum now possesses (Leo and Gerson) has appreciably strengthened the case for assigning it to Germany. The nearest affinity of the type is a fount used by Ludwig of Renchen at Cologne (type 3 of Haebler's numeration, plate 213 of the Gesellschaft für Typenkunde), the lower case of which bears a striking resemblance to that of the Leo; it is true that the first date connected with it is 1483, when Renchen's press is taken to have started, but in style it obviously belongs to the earlier 1470's and it may be a pointer to earlier activities on the part of a craftsman about whom we are very ill informed.[1] Even more persuasive is the evidence of the watermarks, which consist mostly of varieties (one very large) of an oxhead combined either with a rod, a crown and a rosette, or with a shaft, a cross and a star; both designs are very common in German incunabula but do not appear to be met with in Dutch.[2] It may be added that the two Gerson texts were often printed at Cologne and that an edition of the first, ascribable to the Printer of Dares (BMC, I, p. 213, IA. 3361) concludes with a typographical ornament somewhat similar to that found in the same position in the Leo-Printer's edition.

Proctor did not commit himself to assigning a date to the Leo more precise than "[147-]." The editio princeps issued from the press of Sweynheym and Pannartz at Rome in the latter part of 1470 and was presently followed by that of De Lignamine, also at Rome. One or other of these served as a model for the editions of Wenssler at Basle about 1474-75 and of Bartholomaeus de Unkel at Cologne in 1475 or shortly after. That here under discussion shows no connection with any of the four, but may well have been published about the same time as those of Wenssler and Unkel. If so, the market for Leo was assuredly overstocked and the case of the unidentified printer may have been the unhappily common one of a craftsman turning perforce to short and readily saleable texts in an endeavor to recoup himself for the ill success of his main effort. Few copies of any of his work are known, but it is remarkable that a large proportion of these few were at one time owned in Eastern Germany and the parts adjacent.[3]

[1] A date as early as 1478 has recently been claimed for Renchen, also on typological grounds, in S. Korsten, *Die Anfänge des Kölner Buchdrucks* (1957), p. 93.

[2] Briquet nos. 14541-43, 14572, 14573. Varieties of gothic p surmounted by a quatrefoil are found in the Gerson, but this mark is common in Dutch as well as in German incunabula.

[3] The copy of Leo in the Utrecht University Library formerly belonged to the Dominicans of Breslau, and there are two copies at Cracow. The only known copy of Brunus was at Dresden, but must now be presumed lost, to judge by its absence from H. Deckert, *Katalog der Incunabeln der sächsischen Landesbibliothek zu Dresden* (1958). Thus no copy of Gesamtkatalog 5631 is now on record. The Stockholm copies of Gerson and Pius II formerly belonged to the Jesuits of Olmütz, while the only other known copy of Pius II is at Cracow. Of three (or four) known copies of Poggius one is (or was) at Danzig. According to an inscription dated 1664, the Leo in the Morgan Library (PML 25123) was then preserved in the "Domus Probationis" of the Jesuits at Brünn.

As they can scarcely have been printed so far afield, the guess may be permitted that the printer decided to cut his losses in the West and convey himself and his stock from the Rhine to the Oder, in which remote region customers for any sort of typography might still perhaps be found.

It only remains to say that the Leo (IB. 15223) and the Gerson (IA. 15225) will take their place among the German adespota when a Supplement to the BMC comes to be printed.

VICTOR SCHOLDERER

The British Museum

*Some Early Apostrophes to Printing**

From time to time, on such happy occasions as a Caxton or Gutenberg anniversary, speakers are invited to talk to an august audience about such things as the significance to Western man of the development of the printing art. This is a notoriously hard assignment, because nothing very startling or novel can be added to the obvious list of benefits which informed people already know.[1] Yet bibliographical occasions, like patriotic holidays, have to be celebrated in decent academic fashion, with decorum and dispatch—especially if the speech is delivered after a substantial collation. At times however dispatch is slighted, and the speaker becomes swept away with enthusiasm. Such was apparently the case at the convention of the Gutenberg-Gesellschaft on 25 June 1933, when Dr. Adolf Dyroff, who at that time was professor of philosophy and education at the University of Bonn, delivered a twenty-nine-page speech entitled *Die Bedeutung der Druckkunst für das Menschenleben,* which was later published by the Gutenberg-Gesellschaft at Mainz in 1935. Dr. Dyroff was a man of marked Nazi loyalty and enthusiasm, so he considered that the great virtue of the printing art was to render available to millions of potential readers the lessons of *Mein Kampf* and the propaganda of Dr. Goebbels. And, as might be expected, his talk was cluttered with misinformation and misguided opinion which it would be tedious and pointless to relate.

In this note however I would like to relate some early observations on the significance of the printing art which I do not believe are well known, and which strike me as equal in interest to the laudations recorded in the introductions of such early histories of printing as those by Mallinckrodt, La Caille, Chevillier,

* The material for this paper was gathered during the summer of 1959 while the author was a Fellow at The Newberry Library. It is reproduced herewith through the kind permission of Dr. Stanley Pargellis.

[1] See Pierce Butler, *The Origin of Printing in Europe* (Chicago, 1940), pp. 1-28; Curt F. Bühler, "Authors and Incunabula," in *Studies in Art and Literature for Belle da Costa Greene,* ed. Dorothy Miner (Princeton, 1954), pp. 401-6.

Pater, Maittaire, and Orlandi,[2] but unequal to the sensible and comprehensive observations made by Samuel Palmer in his *A General History of Printing* (London, 1733). I am not concerned, at present, with detractions, such as the assertion alleged to have been made by Cardinal Wolsey to Pope Clement VII that the printing art would foment schism in Western Europe,[3] or the assertion made by the Abbot of Sponheim, Johann Tritheim (or von Trittenheim) in his *De laude scriptorum* of 1492 (Hain 15617; Stillwell T-401) that membrane manuscripts were far superior to printed books because they would last for a thousand years while incunables would last but two hundred years.[4] And since the following observations are self-explanatory, I shall set them down without comment:

(1) Pierre Boaistuau, *Theatrum mundi*, trans. John Alday (1581, *STC* 3170): "I can find nothing þ^{t} may be equall or compare to the wonderfull inuention, vtility and dignitie of printing, the which surmounteth all that the antiquitie may conceiue or imagine of excellencie, knowing that it conserueth and keepeth all the conceptions of our soules, it is the treasure that doth immortalize the monument of our spirits, and eternizeth world without end and also bringeth to light the fruits of our labours. And although somewhat may be added to all other acts and humane inuentions, yet this alone has entred with such good hap and perfection in this world, that ther cannot be added nor diminished any thing that doth not render it defectious and deformed: these effects are so mervailous, and executed with such celerity and diligence, that one man alone in one day will print more letters, than the promptest scribe or scrivener may write with pen in the space of one whole year" (sig. R iij^{v}-R iiij^{r}). This last assertion apparently started in Polydore Virgil's *De inventoribus rerum libri tres* of 1499 (Hain 16008; Stillwell V-130): cf. ". . . one printer may print so many letters in one day, that the swiftest scrivener or writer is not able to do so much in a year" (I quote from the English translation of 1685; Wing V-597a, p. 101). The saying became commonplace in the formula: Imprimit ille die, quantum vis scribitur anno, as repeated, *inter alia*, by Nathaniel Wanley, *Wonders of the Little World* (1678; Wing W-709), p. 528.

[2] See Bernardus Mallinckrodt, *De ortu et progressu artis typographicae dissertatio historica* (Cologne, 1640); Jean de La Caille, *Histoire de l'imprimerie et de la libraire* (Paris, 1689: trans. and augmented by James Watson as *A History of the Art of Printing*, Edinburgh, 1713); André Chevillier, *L'origine de l'imprimerie de Paris* (Paris, 1694); Paul Pater, *De Germaniae miracvlo qua simul artis typographicae vniversam rationem explicit Paul Pater* (Leipzig, 1710); Michael Maittaire, *Annales typographici*, 5 vol. (The Hague, 1719-41); Pellegrino A. Orlandi, *Origine e progressi della stampa* (Bologna, 1722).

[3] The Wolsey story is cited with obvious relish by Joseph Ames in his *Typographical Antiquities* (London, 1749), p. 489, from Lord Herbert of Cherbury, *The Life and Raigne of King Henry the Eighth* (1649; Wing H-1504), p. 147.

[4] See W. Wattenbach, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1896), p. 452.

(2) Thomas Milles, *The Treasurie of Auncient and Modern Times* (1613; *STC* 17936): "now . . . with much less paine and labour, books (full of imperfections) haue been found to be corrected, and purged from those macculations, blots, and blemishes, which ordinarilie doe attend on writing. Againe, if written corrected copies had past from some one or two: yet they were so rare to come by, and not to be perused by many earnest and desirous mindes; that it hindered much forward endeuour, which this vniuersality hath liberally friended" (p. 791).

(3) William London, *A Catalogue of the most Vendible Books in England Orderly & Alphabetically Digested* . . . (1658; Wing L-2848): "Had the poor Indians the treasures of learning knowledge contained in Books, who will not say they would surfet of Knowledge, compar'd with many in this age, that in the midst of means to accomplish Wisdome and Knowledge, are only like moths in Books?" (sig. $B2^{v}$-3^{r}). A similar glance at the wide world is essayed in Francis Burges, *Some Observations on the Use and Original of the Noble Art and Mystery of Printing* (Norwich, 1701): "It is well known of the Turks, that they have not the learning, the art in trades, or war, as their neighbors the Germans; and the chief reason is, they have not Printing among them, which they will not suffer; for fear, as it is thought, it should undermine their false religion, and plant Christianity in its stead."[5]

R. H. Bowers

University of Florida

Those Careless Elizabethans: Names Bewitched

It is no secret that Elizabethan proofreading did not achieve the scrupulosity of the modern telephone directory, and it may reasonably be assumed that fallibility was as native to Renaissance writers as to modern scholars of the period. Even when authors were making a maximum effort toward accuracy, error intervened. The prevalence of such errors in personal names became manifest during the editing of the present writer's forthcoming *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in British Books before 1641*. The types of blunder, perhaps of interest to the student of names as well as to the specialist in bibliographical evidence, are illustrated in the following Devil's—or printer's devil's—onomasticon. All examples are drawn from the dedicatory inscriptions or similar formal statements in British books of the period 1560-1640, which are briefly identified by serial number in the standard bibliography, A. W. Pollard and Redgrave's *Short-Title Catalogue, 1475-1640* (1926). These are not the casual

[5] Text in *The Harleian Miscellany* (1809), III, 157.

eccentricities so common in manuscript documents, but aberrations found in formal literary use.

Many forms appearing as errors to the uninitiated are in fact merely spelling variants, either individual idiosyncrasies or attempts at phonetic orthography. The variants of Sir Thomas Caverden (4854) range from Cawarden to Coordenne, and the following instances show how confusing such spellings can be:

Variant	*Book*	*Normal form*
Æton	22561	Sir Robert Aytoun
Forker	88	Edward Farquhar
Harding	11249	John Hawarden
Pherres	24928	Sir Henry Ferrers
Seamer	13491	Sir Henry Seymour
Tryfoord	1437	Sir Edmund Trafford

Among the Elizabethans confusion was endemic with respect to certain Christian names that are now scrupulously distinguished. The most constant confusion involves Edward and Edmund, as notoriously shown by the name "Edw. Spenser" on the title page of the 1592 translation of *Axiochus*, which the bookseller was attributing to the poet Edmund, whatever its actual authorship. Usually the error is in the opposite direction, as in the use of the forms Edmund and Edmond for the knights Sir Edward Bushell (22462) and Cary (11564). The first of these slips was made by the schoolmaster-dramatist James Shirley, who obviously would have made a poor Freshman English teacher. The next most common confusion is between Agnes and Anne, as in the dedication to Dame Agnes Morray (18167), usually known as Anne Murray, Viscountess Stormont. One's patience with such aberrations is exhausted with the discovery that a few Elizabethans seemed to have alternative but completely unrelated names. Thus the well-known literary patroness Anne Dudley, Countess of Warwick, is addressed as Mary both by the poet Spenser and by Edward Monings (23086, 18013).

Many confusing errors are attributable to the compositor's misreading of copy, or perhaps to foul case. Thus an English printer unfamiliar with Scottish names gives us Drummond of "Sawthorn-denne" (5909), and Sir William Faunt becomes an unrecognizable changeling as "Fairut" in an unrecorded book preserved at Illinois, Thomas Cooper's *The Converts First Love*, 1610. Of the following errors, the first (Latham) was corrected during printing and thus appears in only part of the impression:

Variant	*Book*	*Normal form*
Latham	20770	I[ohn]. Tatham
Arkenhead	5909	David Aikenhead

Kickebye	13924	Thomas Kirkby
Pikeling	3043	Sir William Pickering
Plamer	25795	Sir Henry Palmer
Potham	17745	Sir John Hotham

Similarly, the untraceable "T. Grant" who signs verses at the end of the Huntington Library's unique *President for Parentes*, 1571, is presumably a misprint for E[dward]. Grant, translator of this pamphlet by Plutarch.

Confusion over Christian names produces another crop of errors. The most incredible instance is found in Anthony Stafford's memorial volume to his kinsman Henry, Lord Stafford (23125), who is named on the title page as Edward! Of the following blunders, all except the first were corrected either during the printing or in the errata:

Variant	*Book*	*Normal form*
Petro Coplano	1494	Patrick Copland
William Iarret	5226	Gilbert Gerrard
Walter	25626	Martin Harlackinden
Archibald	4747	Andrew Pitcarne

A well-known instance is William Kemp's dedication to "Mrs. Anne Fitton, maid of honour" (14923), which is intended either for the notorious Mary, who was entitled to the style, or for her sister Anne (later Newdegate), who was not. Errors in family names are not so numerous. The fact that Nowell Warner appears as Nowell Clarke (23725) resulted from accidental omission in a pair of names, while the consistent latinization of the name of Alexander Dickson as "Disconus" (19065) presumably reflects someone's concept of Latin phonology.[1]

Renaissance books create a number of mythical English knights, although the faulty state of our information enforces caution. In colloquial speech, the drama, and fiction, the title "Sir" was still applied to the rural clergy, but I recall no instance in which a cleric is formally so addressed in book preliminaries of the period 1560-1640.[2] On the other hand, one must make allowance for baronets, for a multitude of Scottish knights on whom there is no available check, and for an uncertain but considerable number of authentic English knights whose names simply fail to appear in the contemporary records that are consolidated in William A. Shaw's *Knights of England*. Examples of this group of genuine but undocumented knights are Sir Charles Hales (1832) and Sir Edmund Morgan

[1] The dramatist John Webster dedicates to George Berkeley, Lord Berkeley, as George Harding, Lord Berkeley (25176).

[2] The editors of the *Short-Title Catalogue*, who should have known better, listed the fifteenth-century Scottish priest as Sir Richard Holland.

(23545). One must even allow the possibility of authentic foreign honors that were respected in England, as in the case of Sir Christopher Gardiner (18202).[3] After all these concessions, there still remain knights invented by the carelessness of authors and printers. Thus Nathaniel Boteler is designated "Sir" (17944a), and John Gifford (12657a) acquires the undeserved prefix in a subsequent edition (12636), perhaps through a compositor's carelessness. It is not even clear just what men are to be identified with the patrons Sir William Hardy (5768), Sir William Hyde (15706), and Sir Robert Milward (4577), for in each instance error may have occurred in any of the three elements in the phrase. One mythical knight is just a mirage. "S^{r}. Thomas Wake," found in the well-known engraved music book *Parthenia* (11827), is untraceable. A reading glass, however, reveals the form as "S^{t}."; the inscription is actually a title, better transcribed as "St. Thomas's Wake."

Although baronetcies are fewer and more easily verified than knighthoods, errors occur here also. Sir Thomas Tyringham is falsely designated "Bart." on the engraved map of the Fens (in 17827), while Richard, later Baron Newport, is created baronet by a bookseller (one issue of 25870). One would suppose that within the exalted ranks of the peerage, accuracy would be more constant. On the contrary, every type of error may be found. The most frequent blunders are in Christian names, which poor authors perhaps seldom heard used at first hand. Of the following examples, the first is found only in the Folger copy of the book, and probably was canceled as a hopeless blunder.

Variant	*Book*	*Normal form*
Philip	13957	Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel
Gerrard	11763	Gerald Aungier, Lord Aungier
Francis	25620	Edward Russell, Earl of Bedford
Anne	18511	Alice Stanley, Countess of Derby
John	22567	Alexander Erskine, Viscount Fenton
John	21862	James Hamilton, Marquis of Hamilton
Richard	22448	John Lovelace, Lord Lovelace

As an instance of mistaken degree, one observes that Anne Calvert, Lady Baltimore, is designated a Viscountess (17746). Edward May perpetrated a compound error in dedicating to Edmund Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave, as Edward, Earl of Mowbray (16887); it is not strange that he reconsidered and canceled a whole series of dedications from the book. Among the lords spiritual, Theophilus Field, Bishop of Llandaff, is misnamed St. Asaph (17944a). And finally, a foreigner unfamiliar with English names, dedicates to Lancelot An-

[3] Gardiner's knighthood is touched on by James Truslow Adams in the *Dictionary of American Biography*.

drewes, Bishop of Ely, as "Andreae D. Episcopo Eliensi."[4]

The most flagrant concentration of nominal blunders in English literature is probably found in *Fames Roule*, 1637, a pathetic collection of acrostic verses and anagrams by Mary Fage. In this fat volume the poetaster undertakes to address verses individually to every member of the British peerage, as well as to bishops and other dignitaries. Although otherwise unknown to literary history, every dullard lord here claims a place. The discrepancies in this book seem to exhaust the possibilities of error. Apart from frequent exchange in Christian names, there are misreadings of family names and outlandish versions like "St. Calre, Earl of Carceynes" for Sinclair, Earl of Caithness (a pretty exhibit for the student of paleography and textual criticism). Furthermore, some of the names were obsolete by ten years, and others—as far as can be determined—are mythical, although the source of the error can sometimes be surmised. One concludes that Mary Fage must have been the most careless as well as the worst of English poets. In desperation one consults the Caroline equivalent of Burke or Debrett's peerage, Thomas Walkley's *Catalogue of the Nobility*, using the 1635 edition of this scarce compendium. It then unexpectedly appears that Mary Fage took practically every one of her blunders directly from the most reliable reference work at her disposal! Since Parliament had not convened after 1629, one may conclude that Walkley's editor did not take much trouble to correct the *Catalogue* or to bring it up to date; once again politics impinges on literature. One must forgive Mary Fage for her inaccuracy, but, alas, no excuse can be found for the quality of her poetry.

It was all very well for Bishop Corbet to sing, "Farewell, rewards and fairies"; despite both Renaissance and Reformation, the nominal hex survives. Today every newspaper reader is familiar with the recurrent little notices apologizing for errors in details of names and addresses. Is it to be supposed that this article has escaped the spell?

Franklin B. Williams, Jr.

Georgetown University

"The Praise of Musicke," by John Case

In 1586 Joseph Barnes printed at Oxford an anonymous English treatise entitled *The Praise of Musicke* (*STC* 20184), and two years later he printed a Latin treatise called *Apologia Musices* (*STC* 4755) with the author's dedication signed "Io. Ca." Both treatises uphold the same positions and use some of the

[4] In a unique state of Michael Maier's *Arcana Arcanissima*, [1614], at Dr. Williams's Library, London.

same illustrative quotations; the Latin however is not a translation of the English but a revised and expanded presentation of the same line of argument. The two works together provide the most complete and effective defense produced during the Elizabethan period of the cultural value of music and of its use in the church services. They are especially important because they appeared at a time when music was in danger of falling into neglect among the upper classes and when its use in divine services was being attacked by the Puritans.[1]

Anthony à Wood attributed the Latin *Apologia* to the Oxford scholar John Case, who died in 1600; but he did not believe that the 1586 English *Praise* was by the same author, because he thought it had been written by a person "then lately deceased."[2] Joseph Haslewood later pointed out that à Wood's assumption that the author of the *Praise* was "deceased" was an improper deduction from the printer's prefatory remark describing the volume as "pleasant to be read, because it is an Orphan of one of Lady Musickes children," which means no more than that it was the unacknowledged or anonymous work of a devotee of music. Haslewood further pointed out that Case's authorship was established by a poem of Thomas Watson's entitled "A gratification vnto Mr. John Case, for his learned Booke, lately made in the prayes of Musick."[3]

Despite the evidence and arguments presented by Haslewood, bibliographers and cataloguers, perhaps because of à Wood's doubts, have been hesitant to accept the attribution. The *DNB* in its account of Case remarks only that the *Praise* "is also attributed to him"; the *British Museum Catalogue* enters it as "[by J. Case?]"; and the *STC* enters it as anonymous under the heading "*Praise,*" though it cross-references it under the name of Case as "Sometimes attributed." But additional evidence for Case's authorship of the *Praise* is provided by Thomas Ravenscroft, who received his Mus. Bac. in 1605 and who appears to have been personally acquainted with many of the Elizabethan musicians and writers on music. In the preface to his *Briefe Discourse . . . of Charact'ring the Degrees . . . in Measurable Musicke* (1614, sig. **1) he quotes a four-line English translation of Horace, and in the margin notes, "Englished by Doctor Case, Praise of Mus to the Reader." Reference to the *Praise* (sig. *4) shows that Ravenscroft was quoting from it directly and accurately.

The identity of point of view, and the similarity of organization and arguments found in the anonymous *Praise* and the later *Apologia* by "Io. Ca." furnish a strong presumption that both works are from the same hand; while the con-

[1] M. C. Boyd, *Elizabethan Music and Musical Criticism* (Philadelphia, 1940), p. 29.

[2] *Athenæ Oxonienses*, I, 259 (1691).

[3] *The British Bibliographer* II, 541-45 (1812). Haslewood quoted the poem from Bodleian MS Rawlinson Poet. 148. An undated single-sheet printed copy, with the same title and a musical setting by William Byrd, is in the Cambridge University Library (*STC* 4246).

temporary testimony of Watson and Ravenscroft establishes the authorship of the *Praise* beyond a reasonable doubt. *The Praise of Musicke* should therefore have its main entry in the *STC* and other catalogues under the name of Doctor John Case.

WILLIAM RINGLER

Washington University, St. Louis

Artemus Ward His Book, 1862

The following note is the result of a re-examination of *BAL*,[1] entry No. 1524. This further study is based on copies of the book examined since publication of the original description.

Because books issued by Carleton and by his successors present certain bibliographical problems, it is simple wisdom to repeat one of the several cautionary notes in the original *BAL* entry: *the first printing may occur in several states, as yet unidentified.* That suspicion remains valid, and because of it the present note is somewhat more detailed than usual in most *BAL* entries. Quite possibly, publication of these details may serve as a guide for other investigators: hence a record is given of all signature marks noted in the several copies examined of the four identified printings dated MDCCCLXII and (as a control of sorts) of a reprint dated MDCCCLXIV. Examples of all printings here described are in the Houghton Library of Harvard College Library.

ARTEMUS WARD HIS BOOK WITH MANY COMIC ILLUSTRATIONS.

NEW-YORK: CARLETON, PUBLISHER, [LATE RUDD & CARLETON] MDCCCLXII.

Pseudonymous. By Charles Farrar Browne, 1834-1867.

THE SIGNATURE MARKS

Note: A blank space indicates *no signature mark present on the page cited.*

Page	*First Printing*	*Second Printing*	*Third Printing*	*Fourth Printing*	*1864 Printing*
[15]			2	2	
19		2*	2*	2*	2*
24	2				
25	2				
29		3	3	3	3
33	2*	3*	3*	3*	3*
[41]		4	4	4	4
45		4*	4*	4*	4*
[49]	3				

[1] *Bibliography of American Literature*, comp. Jacob Blanck, I (1955; repr. 1959).

Page	*First Printing*	*Second Printing*	*Third Printing*	*Fourth Printing*	*1864 Printing*
55		5	5	5	5
57	3*				
59		5*	5*	5*	5*
67		6	6	6	6
71		6*	6*	6*	6*
73	4				
81	4*	7	7	7	7
85		7*			
92		8			
[95]			8	8	8
97	5				
99		8*	8*	8*	8*
105	5*				
[107]		9	9	9	9
113		9*	9*	9*	9*
121	6	10	10	10	10
127		10*	10*	10*	10*
129	6*				
[135]		11	11	11	11
[141]		11*	11*	11*	11*
145	7				
149		12	12	12	12
153	7*	12*	12*	12*	12*
156	6	6	6	6	6
[163]		13	13	13	13
167		13*	13*	13*	13*
169	8				
175		14	14	14	14
181		14*	14*	14*	14*
191		15	15	15	15
193	9				
195		15*	15*	15*	15*
201	9*				
203		16	16	16	16
209		16*	16*	16*	16*
[217]	10				
219		17	17	17	17
[223]		17*	17*	17*	17*
225	10*				
231		18	18	18	18
[235]		18*	18*	18*	18*

Page	*First Printing*	*Second Printing*	*Third Printing*	*Fourth Printing*	*1864 Printing*
[241]	11				
245		19	19	19	19
249	11*				
251		19*	19*	19*	19*
259		20	20	20	20
[263]		20*	20*	20*	20*

The first printing is sewn in 6's, although signed (essentially) in 12's. It will be observed that in the second and later printings the signing is altered and with one exception worthy of note the signing is correctly given in 6's. The exception is signature mark 8, which in the second printing appears (incorrectly) on p. 92. In the third and later printings this defect is remedied and the mark appears, as it should appear, on p. [95]. It is necessary to keep in mind constantly, when considering the matter of the signing in this book, that the illustrations inserted in the text were reckoned in the printed pagination. The totally erroneous presence of superfluous signature mark 6 on p. 67 in the second and later printings may be attributed to pure aberration—the sort of inexplicable phenomenon prudent bibliographers attribute to nothing more significant than the nocturnal activities of the journeymen who produce the sometimes baffling stuff whereof bibliographical studies are made.

FIRST PRINTING

Pagination:

[i-iv]
Inserted frontispiece; not reckoned in the printed pagination.
[v]-x
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [xi-xii] in the printed pagination.
[xiii-xvi]
[17]-[20]
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [21-22] in the printed pagination.
23-46
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [47-48] in the printed pagination.
[49]-[74]
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [75-76] in the printed pagination.
77-92
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [93-94] in the printed pagination.
[95]-108
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [109-110] in the printed pagination.
[111]-[124]
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [125-126] in the printed pagination.
127-138

Divisional title-leaf, pp. [139-140]
Inserted illustration; not reckoned in the printed pagination.
[141]-160
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [161-162] in the printed pagination.
[163]-[176]
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [177-178] in the printed pagination.
179-186
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [187-188] in the printed pagination.
[189]-[206]
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [207-208] in the printed pagination.
209-214
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [215-216] in the printed pagination.
[217]-[232]
[235]-238
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [239-240] in the printed pagination.
[241]-246
Inserted illustration; reckoned as pp. [247-248] in the printed pagination.
249-[264]
Advertisements, pp. [265-270], paged [3]-8.

Note: In the production of the first printing, the publisher used both a fairly heavy paper, and an appreciably lighter paper. The book occurs on mixed weights within the body of single copies. No copy of the first printing has been seen which was printed entirely on either paper.

Leaf size: 7¼″ x 4⅞″ full.

Illustrations printed on wove pale tan paper.

Collation of letterpress; inserted illustrations here ignored: $[1\text{-}20]^{6}$. The signing (which has little relation to actual folding) indicates that the original intention was to fold and bind in 12's with an inserted unpaged frontispiece; all other illustrations were to be printed as integral leaves of their respective gatherings. The signing, therefore, ignores the inserted frontispiece, but with all other illustrations considered: $[1]\text{-}5^{12}$, 6^{13}, $7\text{-}9^{12}$, 10^{11}, 11^{12}, $[12]^{3}$. The irregularity of 6 and 10 is accounted for by the faulty imposition of the divisional title page (p. [139]) in the first printing.

Summary of Features of First Printing

Pagination as expressed above.

Illustrations printed on wove pale tan paper.

Divisional title-leaf paged [139-140].

In the dedication both parentheses are present in the line: *(A Friend all the Year Round,)*

P. [270]: . . . *Brown's Carpenter's Assistant* . . . [to] . . . *John Bell* . . .

LATER PRINTINGS ISSUED UNDER DATE MDCCCLXII

In describing the known reprints issued under date MDCCCLXII, an abbre-

viated description is given in which only the most salient features are noted. See also the table of signature marks above.

SECOND PRINTING

Collation of letterpress; inserted illustrations ignored: [1-2], 3-20⁶.

Illustrations printed on wove pale tan paper.

The divisional title page is in proper position and occurs as p. [233].

In the dedication both parentheses are present in the line: *(A Friend all the Year Round,)*

P. [270]: . . . *Brown's Carpenter's Assistant* . . . [to] . . . *John Bell* . . .

THIRD PRINTING

Collation of letterpress; inserted illustrations ignored: [1]-20⁶.

Illustrations printed on laid yellow paper.

The divisional title page is in proper position and occurs as p. [233].

In the dedication the terminal parenthesis is lacking in the line *(A Friend all the Year Round,*

P. [270]: . . . *Brown's Carpenter's Assistant* . . . [to] . . . *Home* . . .

FOURTH PRINTING

Collation of letterpress; inserted illustrations ignored: [1]-20⁶.

Illustrations printed on laid buff or laid yellow paper.

The divisional title page is in proper position and occurs as p. [233].

In the dedication both the comma and the terminal parenthesis are lacking: *(A Friend all the Year Round*

P. [270]: . . . *Tom Tiddler's Ground* . . . [to] . . . *The Morgesons* . . .

THE BINDING

A cloth: purple. TR cloth: green. V cloth: purple. Z cloth: brown; green. End papers: brown-coated; tan; tan-orange; blue. Flyleaves.

Note: The spine occurs in two states. The order as given is probable:

A: No fleur-de-lys at head of spine. Other variations present, but this feature is sufficient for immediate identification. Seen only on first printing sheets.

B: Fleur-de-lys at head of spine. Noted on all four printings.

Advertised as "nearly ready" in *Boston Evening Daily Transcript*, 30 Apr. 1862. Published 17 May 1862, according to the publisher's statement in *Artemus Ward His Works* . . . , New York, 1875. The following are all from *Boston Evening Daily Transcript* of dates given: *more than 4000 copies already sold. A new edition ready this morning*—6 June 1862. *Edition after edition has been printed until nearly 6000 copies have been sold . . . a new edition is ready today*—17 June 1862.

Note: In all printings, including the printing dated MDCCCLXIV, the author's name in the copyright notice is misspelled *Brown*.

JACOB BLANCK, Editor,
Bibliography of American Literature

Walt Whitman's Short Stories: Two Addenda

In "Walt Whitman's Short Stories: Some Comments and a Bibliography," *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* LII, 300-6 (1958), I listed twenty-four short stories and pieces of fiction written several years before *Leaves of Grass*. Two items were omitted:

"Reuben's Last Wish," *Washingtonian* (New York), 2 May 1842. [Signed: Walter Whitman.]

"The Madman: An Original Tale by the Author of *Franklin Evans*," *Washingtonian and Organ* (New York), 28 Jan. 1843. [The first chapter and a half of a longer work, apparently never finished, as it is labeled "to be continued."]

I am grateful to Professor Thomas L. Brasher, of Southwest Texas State College, San Marcos, who is editing the fiction for the forthcoming complete *Writings of Walt Whitman* (New York University Press), for pointing out these pieces and some comments on them in Emory Holloway's "More Temperance Tales by Whitman," *American Literature* XXVII, 577-78 (1956).

As I am working on the Whitman bibliography for the NYU edition, both Professor Brasher and I would welcome additions to the twenty-six known items.

WILLIAM WHITE

Wayne State University

News and Notes

The response to our letters sent to authors who have published "Authors' Queries" in *The New York Times Book Review* and elsewhere (see the *PBSA*, Fourth Quarter, 1959, p. 342) has been both colorful and gratifying; more are expected and a classification of the replies must be made. At this point it is possible to say that these published queries do seem to serve a useful purpose, and newspapers and magazines are to be commended for giving space to them. But the writer who has his name and address printed in mass media often becomes the recipient of unusual communications; the media themselves might also do a bit of screening of their inquirers—but more of this next issue.

❀ ❀ ❀

Three important dates for the fall: the opening of The Lilly Library at Indiana University in Bloomington on 30 September, with BSA President Frederick B. Adams, Jr., as principal speaker; the meeting of the BSA in Baltimore on 8 October at the Peabody Institute Library, with a reception the evening before at "Evergreen" (The John Work Garrett Library); and the exhibition in honor of the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of William Beckford at the Yale University Library from 12 October to 12 November.

❀ ❀ ❀

On 4 May at The Pierpont Morgan Library in New York, the Gold Medal of The Bibliographical Society (London) was presented to Dr. E. A. Lowe, Professor of Palaeography at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. The medal was presented on behalf of the Society by its Vice President, Mr. John Carter, who called Dr. Lowe, "the most illustrious palaeographer of our time." Dr. Lowe is the third American to receive this honor, the previous recipients having been Dr. Wilberforce Eames in 1929 and Dr. Lawrence C. Wroth in 1957. In accepting the award Dr. Lowe paid gracious tributes to his colleagues, particularly those who have assisted him in his monumental *Codices latini antiquiores*, and to the many institutions and foundations which have aided him in his research and its subsequent publication.

❀ ❀ ❀

The Governor of Minnesota has proclaimed 1960 as Sinclair Lewis year, for it is the seventy-fifth anniversary of his birth, the fortieth of the publication of *Main Street*, and the thirtieth of his receipt of the Nobel Prize for Literature. From the end of May until fall, the Library of Congress will have an exhibition of Lewis's books and manuscripts drawn mainly from the collection formed by

the late Jean Hersholt, which includes many unusual presentation copies. Perhaps the single most interesting piece that will be shown is Lewis's own copy of the first edition of his *Nobel Prize Address* (1931), of which three thousand copies were printed up by his American publishers, based on the cabled report of the address as received by *The New York Times*. In his copy Lewis quickly made revisions so extensive that a new edition became necessary; in fact the first edition was so unsatisfactory that two-thirds of the copies were destroyed. The University of Minnesota Library will heed the proclamation of the Governor and exhibit some of the Lewis books and manuscripts in its collections. What Sinclair Lewis would have thought of a gubernatorial proclamation in his honor must remain a matter of conjecture.

❀ ❀ ❀

In his "Librarian's Occasional Letter to the Faculty" of April, 1960, Lawrence Clark Powell announced his intention of retiring from the librarianship of the University of California on 30 June 1961. During his seventeen years as University Librarian more than a million volumes have been added to the collections and Dr. Powell has gained a national reputation both as a library administrator and as an interpreter not only of rare books and manuscripts, but just plain good books, to the general public. It is now highly probable that Dr. Powell will acquire an international reputation in the same sphere, for in April he began a world tour in search of books for the UCLA libraries, with many speaking engagements along the way. Dr. Powell will retain his new post as Dean of the Library School at UCLA and his more familiar one as Director of the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library—and will continue to commute across the city of Los Angeles.

❀ ❀ ❀

Frederick R. Goff of the Library of Congress reports that *A Third Census of Fifteenth-Century Books in American Libraries* is now thirty per cent complete, with 3,500 entries in their final form. Mr. Goff is still accepting reports on volumes not hitherto recorded in the *Census* and all readers who know of the location of such volumes are urged to communicate with him.

❀ ❀ ❀

Dr. Harry Miller Lydenberg, a Past President of the BSA, died on 16 April at the age of eighty-five. He is best remembered for his long association with The New York Public Library, of which he was Director from 1934 to 1941 and of which he published a history in 1923. Those who had the privilege of working with Dr. Lydenberg will always recall him as a gentle but courageous scholar with a seemingly boundless knowledge of books and librarianship. The works

which Dr. Lydenberg wrote, edited, or translated have remained standard in their respective fields, and it will be many years before the combination of his ability and humanity is seen again.

❀ ❀ ❀

The Rare Books Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries, which had such a successful meeting at the University of Virginia last year, will meet on Monday, 20 June, at 10 A.M. in the Redpath Library at McGill University in Montreal. The program, confined this year to a single day, will be devoted to "Collecting in the Field of Science," and the speakers will be Bern Dibner of the Burndy Library in Norwalk, Connecticut; Jacob Zeitlin of Zeitlin & Ver Brugge, Los Angeles; and Richard Pennington, Librarian of McGill University. A tea will be held in the Osler Library of McGill at 4:30 P.M. the same day. The 1961 Rare Books Section Conference is still in the planning stage but, since the American Library Association will be meeting in Cleveland next year, the Conference may be held in Oberlin, about thirty miles away. Conservation of books and manuscripts will probably be the theme of the 1961 Conference.

❀ ❀ ❀

In the last year of his life, William Morris wrote a delightful description of Kelmscott Manor House, his permanent country home, and called this article, "Gossip About an Old House on the Upper Thames." It was printed in a magazine conducted by members of the Birmingham Guild of Handicraft and portions of it are reprinted in Mackail's biography of Morris. The autograph manuscript, in Morris's beautiful calligraphic hand, is owned by a New York collector and a new printing of the entire work would be welcome. About 1890 Morris took the name of Kelmscott for his private press in Hammersmith. All this is prefatory to some comment on the growth of interest in William Morris and his work during the past two decades in both England and the United States. The William Morris Society flourishes in both countries and has sponsored meetings and exhibitions and the English group has been active in the preservation and care of the Manor House and its surroundings. From 9 October to 31 December of last year, an exhibition, "William Morris and the Kelmscott Press," was held in the Library of Brown University in Providence and was seen by BSA members who attended the meeting there last October. On 7 December, Philip C. Duschnes of New York spoke there on William Morris and the magnificent works which issued from his press. A detailed catalogue of this exhibition, together with the address by Mr. Duschnes, is now in the hands of the Anthoensen Press; copies will be distributed to members of the BSA and to Friends of the John Hay Library at Brown University through the kindness of

John M. Crawford, Jr. Morris's craftsmanship and his revival of the typographical art have had a considerable influence on many aspects of our modern life, but a mild remonstrance on the subject of Morris was voiced on 2 May in New Haven, when Robert F. Metzdorf, editor of *PBSA*, addressed an audience in the Yale University Library on the subject, "Victorian Book Decoration." The speech opened an exhibition of Victorian bindings and illustrations. Dr. Metzdorf pointed out that Morris had been given credit (and had himself accepted credit) as the originator of many views which were in fact promulgated by others. William Pickering and the Whittingham Press were evoked as forerunners in the design and execution of fine printing, and the work of Henry Shaw, Augustus Welby Pugin, Owen Jones, and Matthew Digby Wyatt was noted as containing many of the principles for which Morris has been given complete credit. The pioneer work of Shaw was especially stressed, and Pevsner was quoted in showing Wyatt's enunciation of many of Morris's statements, thirty years before the Kelmscott Press began operations. The speaker urged that a reappraisal and redistribution of kudos be attempted, and that Morris be given his just deserts, with no trimmings of cultism added.

❀ ❀ ❀

The Middle Atlantic Section of the BSA met for luncheon at the Princeton Inn on Friday, 13 May. The luncheon coincided with the thirteenth annual meeting of the Manuscript Society and with the annual meeting of the Friends of the Princeton Library. Edwin Wolf, 2nd, new Secretary of the BSA and chairman for the Middle Atlantic region, conducted an informal discussion of what he described as the "separation of the bookman and the academic world." At a recent meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Louisville he and others had spoken of the lack of communication between rare book librarians and teachers of history, especially those teachers who live at a distance from the larger library centers. It is hoped that the speeches delivered at Louisville on this topic may be printed in the Third Quarter of *PBSA*.

Book Reviews

Bibliography of American Literature. Compiled by Jacob Blanck for the Bibliographical Society of America. Volume Three: Edward Eggleston to Bret Harte. New Haven: Yale University; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 482 pp. $15.00.

What can be said, except to praise once more,
A third time now, this vigorous enterprise
Which guides, corrects, and patiently supplies
Minutiae of bibliographic lore
Set forth in detail not achieved before?
Here diligence and learning supervise
A task together, without compromise
Of virtuous ends which either contests for.

When such a book is offered for review,
What can be said, except again to thank
His colleagues but especially Jacob Blanck
For doing well what they set out to do?
From them we learn again that each man gains
When scholarship remembers to take pains.

Lewis Leary

Columbia University

Grolier 75: A Biographical Retrospective to Celebrate the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Grolier Club in New York. New York: Grolier Club, 1959. xii, 240 pp. 1000 copies. $15.00.

A reader of this book may reasonably conclude that the present members of the Grolier Club have a formidable task facing them if they are to maintain the high standards and exert the same persistency in collecting pursuits that characterized the seventy-five members whose biographies appear in this "retrospective" volume commemorating the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Club. Truly, these collectors, dealers, typographers, designers, scholars, and others constitute an illustrious company and it is hoped that the cultural and economic climate of the next seventy-five years will be as favorable to the conduct of such notable collecting pursuits.

The biographies should be of special value to young book collectors, although the information contained in the various sketches covers a wide range of subject matter of interest to the new and the old collector. We learn of the fields and methods of collecting and, incidentally, read with interest and profit of some of the "politics" of selling and purchasing.

In addition to the book's accomplishment in commemorating past members, it has reference value and demonstrates the social and economic conditions which stimulated and nurtured the projects of the notable seventy-five. We learn of the reputation and specialties of the great dealers of the past and present who are worthy of the name of bibliopoles; the present location of distinguished book and manuscript collections is given; there are amusing and serious references to prices and values; the history of auction sales appears piecemeal through the seventy-five articles; opinions of the seventy-three biographers concerning published bibliographies and printed catalogues of collections make interesting reading.

R. W. G. Vail's introduction, succinct and fitting, strikes the keynote of the book and appropriately directs attention to the "patron saint" of the Club—Jean Grolier. The book is handsomely designed and printed by Joseph Blumenthal of the Spiral Press, who also served as a member of the book's editorial committee.

It is, perhaps, unreasonable to expect uniform style and an even literary quality in seventy-five biographies by seventy-three different writers. The very nature of the book, doubtless, precludes this. The editor merits commendation upon the success of the volume. It seems a fitting tribute to the first seventy-five years of the Club's history. After all, the accomplishments of the individual members constitute the real history of the Club.

Lester G. Wells

Syracuse University Library

Amor librorum; Bibliographic and Other Essays; a Tribute to Abraham Horodisch on His Sixtieth Birthday. Amsterdam: Distributed by Erasmus Antiquariaat, 1958. xvii, 304 pp.

The thirty essays in this volume are varied enough to tempt bookmen of all persuasions, but the variety is highly appropriate to the work of the honoree (see list of his publications, pp. ix-xvii, compiled by Emma Dronckers). It is no more possible to review properly all of these essays in a few hundred words than it is to evaluate properly the contributions of Mr. Horodisch to the world of books in a short bibliography. Suffice it to say, the editors had no problem in attracting contributions from leading authorities in their respective fields, e.g., Armin

Renker on paper, Caterina Santoro on early Italian printing, Ernst Kyriss on binding, and H. de la Fonteine Verwey on Gérard de Nerval.

The essays are grouped under the following headings: paper; paleography, miniatures, printing types; history of printing; history of book illustration; history of bookbinding and publishing; libraries; modern book art, bookplates; and varia and miscellanea. At the risk of doing an unintentional injustice to some of the contributors, only a few of the essays can be noted here. The sole American contribution is from Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt and Norman Petteway, "Human Alphabets," a whimsical, richly illustrated study of the use of the human form to represent letters. The only essay with an American theme is H. F. Wijnman's "Maria Monk de zwarte non" with a bibliography showing the international implication of the affair. D. Giltay Veth's perceptive "Op zoek naar het ideale exlibris" makes appropriate mention of the work of Alice Horodisch-Garman as a bookplate designer.

There are a number of little known but rewarding by-ways of the book world explored by the contributors. Günter Arnolds' essay on the collection of Hans Grisebach rehabilitates a bibliophilic career overshadowed by that of a more famous brother, Eduard. M. Draak of Amsterdam reports the discovery of a possibly significant new text of Wace's *Brut* in the Royal Library of The Hague. L. Fuks of Amsterdam provides a checklist of the Hebrew imprints of the Athias family in Amsterdam in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

If the success of a bibliographical homage volume may be measured in terms of the bookish gossip it can excite, the Horodisch volume is thoroughly satisfying in this respect. The final criterion of excellence, the scholarly soundness of most of the articles, is also satisfied; and the standards represented by the honoree are properly observed by the contributors.

Lawrence S. Thompson

University of Kentucky Library

Lohf, Kenneth A., and Eugene P. Sheehy. *Yvor Winters: A Bibliography.* Denver, Colo.: Alan Swallow, 1959. 35 pp.

Whoever undertakes a bibliography of a living writer, whose work is presumably incomplete, usually feels that he must justify the undertaking. However, it is unlikely that Yvor Winters' stoutest critical opponents would deny the usefulness of a Winters bibliography. As paladin in critical writing and in verse of a classical tradition, Winters has unquestionably earned a niche in mid-twentieth-century American literature.

This bibliography, complete through 1957, with some 1958 entries, is in two

parts: the first has works by Winters; the second, about him. Part I contains poetry books and pamphlets, prose books and pamphlets, miscellaneous works, individual poems, poetry translations, and essays and reviews. Of these, only the books and pamphlets of poetry are completely described; the reason given is that some of the volumes of poetry are collector's items. Part II has two sections: books and periodical articles about Winters, and reviews of his works. The latter section is especially (and justifiably) full, since "a full evaluation of [Winters'] work is yet to be written."

Although the worth of a book cannot be judged by typographical errors, nevertheless its comeliness is marred by proofreading somewhat less than adequate. In this book, "criticism" is mispelled in item 377; in item 392 "in" is written "is"; on page 34 in the index the same item (Samuel French Morse) is listed twice; Francis Vielé-Griffin's name is misspelled in the index; Saint Theresa is indexed with "Saint" italicized. Floyd Stovall's name is misspelled both in item 414 and in the index. More important than typographical errors, however, are some omissions of information which would have made the bibliography more useful. For example, the Table of Contents lists the sections but does not give page numbers. Although there is some cross-referencing, there is not enough. Item 344 is said to be Winters' reply to Hayden Carruth's article, but Carruth's article is not listed. Item 411, an important criticism by John Crowe Ransom, is not indexed.

However, despite these and similar faults and omissions, Messrs. Lohf and Sheehy have constructed a useful tentative bibliography.

Scott C. Osborn

Mississippi State University

Manna, Anna M., *comp. La Raccolta Dantesca della Biblioteca Universitaria di Napoli.* (Biblioteca di Bibliografia Italiana: Supplementi a la *Bibliofilia*, diretta da R. Ridolfi, xxxiv). Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 1959. 2 vols. 10,000 lire.

This *Raccolta* consists of three Dante collections in the Biblioteca Universitaria of Naples: the one donated to it in 1872 by Alfonso Della Valle dei Marchesi di Casanova, conspicuous on account of the large number of editions of the *Divine Comedy*; the "legato Imbriani" made in 1891 (five years after Vittorio Imbriani's death in 1886), with its many editions of Dante's minor works, *commenti*, and numerous Dante biographies; and other Danteana owned by the library, chiefly made up of editions and critical materials printed during the past seventy-five years. Its most precious volume is the extremely rare incunabulum printed at Naples in 1477, which is lacking in the great Dante collections of Cornell University and the Evan Mackenzie Library, and of which there are only three

complete and two imperfect copies in Italy. Other rarities are the famous Nidobeato edition, Milan, 1477-78, a beautiful folio volume ornamented with miniatures; the two Aldine editions of 1502 and 1515; the *Dante historiado* annotated by Landino (Venice, Zanni), 1507; the 1544 Marcolini edition, the first to present Vellutello's commentary; the 1564 Marchiò Sessa edition which brings together both the Landino and Vellutello commentaries; and the Pietro da Fino edition of 1568, the first and only publication to contain the well-known Daniello commentary. Though by no means complete, the editions of the works of Dante in the original are fairly well represented and in some cases comprise volumes of high significance.

Translations, on the other hand, are noticeably scarce. As to the works on Dante, if we were to eliminate from the alphabetical list the names of writers of periodical articles which appear in *L'Alighieri, Giornale dantesco, Bullettino della societa dantesca, Studi danteschi,* the *Jahrbuch der deutschen Dante-Gesellschaft,* and the *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch,* we should find that they do not bulk large.

On the whole, it can be said that the *Raccolta* is a good one but no better than those found in dozens of other libraries in Italy and elsewhere. Hence, outside its immediate environment its direct usefulness to Dante students is bound to be rather limited. Indirectly, however, it can be very serviceable. Its tripartite index "Indice degli autori," "Classificazione delle opere su Dante," and "Indice dei soggetti") greatly simplifies the task of locating information on a specific subject, which is always an arduous one in the case of such a bibliographically vast topic as Dante. Its copious cross references referring to reviews and notices on the studies listed should aid in establishing clearer notions as to their character and importance. Of considerable value as a timesaver is the incorporation in the author list of what amounts to an up-to-date combined table of contents of the major Dante journals (i.e. those already mentioned). Miss Manna's compilation is, then, something more than a special catalogue; it is, thanks to the meticulous care that she has devoted to it, a valuable work of reference which all Dantists will appreciate having within easy reach for checking and consultation.

Joseph G. Fucilla

Northwestern University

Miller, Edwin Haviland. *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England: A Study of Nondramatic Literature.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959. xii, 282 pp. $5.00.

It is a well-recognized fact that writers and publishers, for obvious reasons, have never been anxious to air their vexed pecuniary and editorial dealings in

public. Hence the literary historian, understandably interested in such matters, has usually been forced to rely on inference and guesswork (how does one interpret an author's squeal that he has been cheated? to what actual extent did Maxwell Perkins "improve" the style of a Fitzgerald or Wolfe?), to say nothing of dealing with calculated misrepresentation (e.g. Curll *vs.* Pope). In 1881, when Alexandre Beljame wrote his classic *Le public et les hommes de lettres en Angleterre au dix-huitième siècle*, which did not receive the homage of translation into English until 1948, he argued that not until the time of Pope did "le métier d'écrivain est devenu une profession libérale"; and that not until the time of Charles II was it possible for a historian to compose a satisfactory account of publication because only then "les documents deviennent alors plus nombreux et plus certains, les faits plus nets et plus précis" (p. viii). Despite these somber caveats, in 1909, Phoebe Sheavyn wrote *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age*, which, until the publication this year of Miller's new book, has been the only full-dress dissertation available on the beginnings of professional authorship in England and the sociology and economics thereof. And I should say at the outset that Miller's book, despite its self-imposed limitations on subject matter, is an enormous improvement on Miss Sheavyn's work: it is an up-to-date, readable, sensible, well-documented book that handles a mass of detail with assurance and control.

The self-imposed limitations are: (1) as the subtitle indicates, the deliberate exclusion of all dramatic publication, which at once deprives Miller of a large body of collateral evidence, and may disappoint workers in the Shakespeare industry; (2) a narrowing of attention to the decades between 1580 and 1600, which deprives the book of much "sweep" (I wish that somebody had corrected and revised in the light of recent scholarship the early chapters of Frank Mumby's *Publishing & Booksellers* when it was reissued in 1954 since it is about the only easily available book which gives a beginning student a "sweep," a panorama, of publication in England from the scribal era down to the present); (3) attention devoted primarily to books written in the English tongue (I grant that a consideration of material written, say, in French or Latin would probably not alter Miller's findings; but I believe it important to repeat monotonously that Elizabethan England was not a cultural island. One of the virtues of a book such as Vernon Hall's *Renaissance Literary Criticism* is that it is comparative in method, it treats Italian and French criticism as well as Tudor, and hence attains a solidity of foundation not otherwise available). But no doubt these limitations were duly considered by Professor Miller and the syndics of the Harvard University Press, and imposed for practical reasons of space and time.

Miller's book is divided into seven chapters, or essays: the first, on milieu, sets forth the socially inferior status of the professional writer. There is probably little

use in attempting to differentiate between amateur and professional writers except in extreme cases like Sidney and Dekker. On p. 134 Miller uses a quotation from one of Sir John Davies' satires in conjunction with a quotation from Dekker; Sir John would surely have to be classified as an amateur on social grounds, but when he writes satire he behaves as a professional writer. Miller also rightly notes that Nashe could never make up his mind as to whether he was a professional or amateur, especially in his equivocal attitude towards patronage (pp. 132, 140). The second chapter describes the heterogeneous composition in caste and class of potential Elizabethan readers; and the third chapter disarmingly expounds the difficulty of assessing the literary taste of this audience with much precision (who read the books on library shelves? p. 64), beyond the hazard of some obvious generalizations (Elizabethan writers did not provide works of "Wildean amorality" for their readers, p. 93).

Chapter four deals with the elusive topic of patronage and dedications, both authorized and clearly unauthorized, as in the racket called "falconry" by Dekker. My own feeling has been that unless we know the actual details of financial largesse involved in a patronage relationship a printed dedication usually points to a problem rather than solves it. Chapter five, on the financial relations between writers and stationers, gives reasons (p. 149) for suspecting that so-called piracy or unauthorized publication might often have been the product of deliberate collusion to silence carping critics and whet the appetite of curious readers. Literary flittings, such as the notorious Nashe-Harvey fracas, may likewise have been calculated maneuvers (p. 168). But Miller is forced to concede that generalization on such matters is impossible since "we are once more confronted with a paucity of concrete data" (p. 151). He also is thwarted by the fact that the Stationers' Company kept no record of payments to authors (p. 151). The next chapter, on censorship, demonstrates conclusively that in practice government interference was not as stringent or successful as has often been supposed (Miss Sheavyn did not always place her documents of control in the witness box and subject them to cross-examination, which is the proper job of a historian), and validates McKerrow's telling dictum that not a single major literary work was censored during the Elizabethan era (p. 197). The last chapter is delightful: it surveys the Elizabethan Grub Street with a wealth of apposite illustration. A definition of the opprobious term "hack" is attempted (pp. 206, 210, *et passim*); and convincing detective work is employed in demonstrating the shameless manner in which hacks pilfered from each others' works with the aid of "scissors and paste."

Except for the last chapter there is little new information in Miller's book, since he is dealing with well-worn subjects that have been treated in many studies such as Marjorie Plant's *The English Book Trade*. But his book may be heartily

recommended to the beginning student and to that vague but necessary hypothetical entity, the "general reader." As stated above, it is a sensible, readable account of a difficult and highly elusive subject—elusive because the sources and documents are not, as Beljame insisted, "plus nombreux, plus certains, les faits plus nets et plus précis."

R. H. Bowers

University of Florida

Morison, Stanley. *L'inventaire de la Fonderie Le Bé selon la transcription de Jean Pierre Fournier.* Paris: A. Jammes, 1957. 30 pp. (Documents typographiques français I.) of. 1,000.

Veyrin-Forrer, Jeanne, and André Jammes. *Les premiers caractères de l'Imprimerie Royale; étude sur un spécimen inconnu de 1643.* Paris: A. Jammes, 1958. [24] pp. (Documents typographiques français II.) of. 900.

Judging from the first two fascicles, it appears that the inauguration of this new series of French typographical source materials will go far towards filling serious gaps in our knowledge of the history of printing.

The first item, with commentary in English, is a transcription of a deed of sale (dated 20 Dec. 1730) of the Le Bé foundry materials by the daughters of Le Bé III to Jean Pierre Fournier, whose father Jean Claude had managed the foundry for the Le Bés, and who later continued the work. Mr. Morison shows that what purports to be a current inventory is, in actuality, a careful transcript of an earlier original inventory of about 1598.

The value of the document lies not only in the fact that it clarifies the history of the Le Bé foundry, but also in the light which it sheds upon sixteenth-century French type engravers, since the inventory lists the names of the various types and the engravers, and the number of matrices in each font. Only one hundred sets of matrices and forty-five sets of punches out of the 201 items in the inventory are ascribed to definite artists, but even these attributions are of inestimable value, because the dozen or so artists include Attaignant, Augereau, Colines, Garamond, Granjon, Henry du Tour, and some others less known.

The second fascicle contains a facsimile reproduction of type specimens for the Imprimerie Royale (now the Imprimerie Nationale) in 1643, along with three facsimiles of earlier specimen sheets from other sources.

This recently discovered specimen book of 1643, belonging to the Bibliothèque Nationale, is apparently unique. Probably privately printed for the use of the Imprimerie Royale, it is important in that it shows the fonts collected by Sébas-

tien Cramoisy for the printing office founded three years earlier. The authors have identified, in a very useful table, the various faces illustrated.

The two monographs are well printed and of excellent design, although the second is three inches taller and two inches wider than the first. It is to be hoped that in successive issues the size will be standardized. A projected third monograph will be written by Mr. Morison on manuscript notes of Guillaume II Le Bé about sixteenth-century French founders, a publication which should add luster to this new series as well as prove extremely valuable in itself.

RICHARD H. SCHIMMELPFENG

Washington University, St. Louis

NICOLL, ALLARDYCE. *A History of English Drama, 1660-1900.* Volume VI, Alphabetical Catalogue of Plays, 1660-1900. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959. xii, 565 pp. $12.50.

Professor Nicoll's *History* began appearing as separately titled books in 1923, the first being *The Restoration Stage.* Thereafter came the four volumes which make up the story of the English stage from Davenant's beginnings before the Restoration until the appearance of Shaw and Yeats at the very end of the last century. Now all have been appropriately revised and brought together in six volumes under a single title, as given above, coming out between 1952 and 1959, the last two appearing in this last year. We are concerned here with Volume VI only, the index volume.

It is, as Professor Nicoll observes, more than an index; it can stand alone and be used independently of the preceding volumes. It provides a short-title catalogue of all the plays known to have been written or produced between the dates given in the title. It gives the volume and the number of the page or pages on which reference to the play is made. Like the handlists in the earlier volumes, it gives dates and authors where known, though it does not repeat, of course, the extensive information about stage production and history presented in these handlists. It includes entries, however, which do not appear in the handlists—names of plays lately discovered, with authors (if known). These are marked with a plus sign. They will doubtless be added to the handlists, with other information, in later editions. The dates given in all instances are of the earliest record, whether of "production, publication or submission to the Lord Chamberlain." Alternative titles are given where verified, so that cross reference can readily be made. And although duplications doubtless occur, the author has wisely chosen to err on the side of inclusiveness rather than exclusiveness. The

index listing carries no information about publication, nor could it be expected to.

The book is concerned with the records of dramatic activity, stage affairs chiefly, not with publication and printing. Bibliographically, then, the work is of indirect (but of none the less great) importance. It furnishes clues for the discovery of numerous lost and forgotten plays, both published and unpublished, some of which very probably deserve to be brought to light, described, identified, and if of literary or stage value, edited and published. Not always does the best survive, though the fittest may.

In spite of all the work put into this volume by the author, the user may still find himself handicapped now and then. Lack of space made it impossible for Professor Nicoll to include the titles of Italian operas, so many of which were produced in London during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the interest of completeness we could wish they had been listed. To the present reviewer it also seems a pity not to have here the name of the original author of an adapted play or of a translation. This is useful information to have, especially where titles have (as so often they have) suffered a change.

One of the most important contributions made by the present volume is the completion up to 1900 of the lists of plays known in England or produced on the English stage. The handlists in the separate volumes and this short-title index, together with Harbage's *Annals of the English Drama, 975-1700* (soon to be revised), Greg's lists and monumental *Bibliography*, Chambers' lists in *The Elizabethan Stage*, and Bentley's in the last three volumes of his *Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, afford the student of the drama or the historian of the stage the completest listing of plays known or produced in England that we have ever had. Without too great difficulty we can now find out the titles of most of the plays that were written and approximately when—very often when and where—they were produced, whether they were printed, and where (if in manuscript) they are to be found. Work remains to be done, of course, but the accomplishment has been great: perhaps that most needed is bibliographical and editorial.

Thomas B. Stroup

University of Kentucky

Piloni, Luigi. *Bibliografia della Posta e Filatelia Italiane.* (Biblioteca di Bibliografia Italiana xxxiii.) Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 1959. xxii, 396 pp. 16 plates.

Luigi Piloni's bibliography is the thirty-third and most recent volume added to the *Biblioteca di Bibliografia Italiana*. This series, begun in 1923, has provided bibliographies on materials available in Italian libraries and on Italian subjects

of the most diverse sort, ranging from Etruscan history to Dante studies, from Oriental manuscripts to Sicilian typography.

The present contribution will, of course, be welcomed by philatelists; but others, too, can draw profit from it. Well over half of the 2,800 works cited by Piloni are devoted to the Italian postal service, its history, and its mode of operation. The sharp impact that a developing postal service has had on travel and communication and on the general pattern of everyday life is well known to social and economic historians and certainly they, as well as students of Italian institutions, will discover titles of interest in this volume. Postal history, legislation, organization, rates, itineraries, and guide books—even postal buildings—are some examples of the rich variety of topics treated.

Happily, Mr. Piloni has chosen to interpret "Italian" in the broadest sense. We are thus supplied with the names of works which probe the antecedents of modern postal systems under the Roman Empire, during the Middle Ages as illustrated by the practices of the papacy and the Italian city-states, and in more recent times by the efforts of the states which composed the Italian peninsula prior to unification. The postal service of modern Italy, a world leader in this field, is particularly well documented.

The bibliography, arranged by subject categories, is furnished with several indexes and with a brief historical introduction. One shortcoming, however, prevents the bibliography from being ideally useful. It is not annotated. How helpful it would be to have a few words of comment on the utility of the books included—all the more since Mr. Piloni, author of *Enciclopedia del Francobollo*, would seem to have been well qualified for the task! As Dr. Stanley Pargellis recently warned in the pages of this journal, "The only way we can extricate ourselves from the mounting ocean of books, get to shore, and start reading what we haven't much time in one life to read, is through the life rafts of selective, annotated, and . . . critical bibliography."

While one may regret the absence of "life rafts" to accompany this "ocean of books" on the Italian postal service and philately, one is still grateful to Mr. Piloni for the very considerable service his bibliography does render.

Philip A. Knachel

The Folger Shakespeare Library

Powell, Lawrence Clark. *Books in My Baggage; Adventures in Reading and Collecting*. Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Company, 1960. 256 pp. $4.50.

This most recent book by L. C. Powell is a collection of twenty-three essays

written apparently at different times over a considerable period, and originally aimed at different audiences. They are collected under four headings. The first is of eight pieces under the general heading "First Person Bibliographical." The second consists of three short essays on Mr. Powell's book-buying adventures in England some years ago. The third section is devoted to sketches of three of his favorites, Robinson Jeffers, Henry Miller, and J. Frank Dobie. Part four is entitled "Landscape with Books" and is, as is to be expected, about his beloved Southwest. There is also added a list of books about books of several dozen familiar titles ranging from Adams to Wroth.

The first eight essays are concerned with his literary enthusiasms as fancy leads him in English, French, and American letters. The approach is sentimental, and the enthusiasm contagious. In rich prose he relates the effect of the masterpieces on his sensibilities. His conversation is bookish as well as literary about Joyce, Casanova, D. H. Lawrence, Rabelais, Whitman, Melville, and dozens of others.

The anecdotes on book collecting and buying in England, many will find of interest. For himself, his love of books is retail—for the universities of California, wholesale.

In the fourth part the relation of the landscape to literature is gone into with characteristic exuberance. It is here more than in the rest that it is possible to detect that the audiences may have been younger. They are led by the hand through the landscape of the Southwest with literary allusions which will excite them.

Throughout all the essays Powell never forgets he is a librarian by profession. As bookman or traveler, critic or raconteur, he insists again and again that the librarian should be as literate as the reader, and that somehow the emotional impact of the book on the librarian will be communicated to the reader.

Donald F. Cameron

Rutgers University Library

BRIEFER MENTION

Henryk Baranowski's *Bibliografia Kopernikowska 1509-1955* (Warsaw, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1958) is a definitive bibliography of Copernicus sponsored by the Komitet Historii Nauki of the Polska Akademia Nauk. There are 3,750 entries, including Copernicus' writings, bibliographies, general monographs on Copernicus, biography, work and publications, Copernicus in belles-lettres, Copernicus in art, museums and exhibits, and celebrations and anniversaries. Baranowski has excavated numerous minor essays in ob-

scure newspapers and periodicals, and his work is considerably more extensive than any previous Copernican bibliography. An especially useful feature is the list of locations for the various editions of Copernicus' published work in the first section.

Robert L. Collison, *Indexes and Indexing* (New York, John de Graff, 1959; 200 pp., $4.50), is a new and enlarged edition of a guide to the technique of indexing which was favorably received at the time of original publication. The first section deals with the indexing of books; the second, with indexing films, discs, and periodicals, with business indexing, and with co-ordinate and mechanical indexing; and the third, with proofreading, rules for arranging entries, the number of entries per page, the indexer's reference collection, and related technical matters. There is a carefully prepared index to this book on indexing.

Helmut E. Gerber, *George Moore: an Annotated Bibliography of Writings about Him* (Lafayette, Indiana, 1959; 91 pp.; *English Fiction in Transition* II, no. 2 [in two parts]; $0.50), is a comprehensive list of critical and biographical material on Moore from all types of sources. All of the some 600 entries have been examined by the compiler and his collaborators, and brief pertinent annotations have been provided for all. The second number of Vol. I of *English Fiction in Transition* contained a similar bibliography on Ford Madox Ford, also by Mr. Gerber.

Donna Gerstenberger and George Hendrick, in their *Directory of Periodicals Publishing Articles in English and American Literature and Language* (Denver, Alan Swallow, 1959; 178 pp., $3.50), record 386 serials of varying quality, frequency, and size. For each entry there is information on address, frequency, price, date when founded, fields of interest, manuscript information, payment, and copyright. The arrangement is alphabetical by title, and there is an index listing titles under subjects, but not with a page reference.

Rudolf Juchhoff's *Sammelkatalog der biographischen und literarkritischen Werke zu englischen Schriftstellern des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts (1830-1958); Verzeichnis der Bestände in deutschen Bibliotheken* (Krefeld, Scherpe Verlag, n.d.) is primarily a guide to the holdings of German libraries in the field of nineteenth- and twentieth-century English literature. However, it is so extensive that students of English literature everywhere may neglect it at their peril. Particularly important is the listing of manuscript dissertations in German university libraries. The arrangement is alphabetical by author. It is a tragedy that Juchhoff had originally planned a comprehensive bibliography of English culture in the post-romantic period and actually completed it: part of it was in press in 1942 when the type was destroyed by bombing.

Otto Klapp's *Bibliographie der französischen Literaturwissenschaft* (v. 1- , 1960-) published by Vittorio Klostermann in Frankfurt/Main is, rather astonishingly, the first effort to provide a regular current bibliography of French literature. The first volume covers the years 1956-58 and contains some 10,000 entries. It is arranged in eight major sections (general studies, middle ages, sixteenth century, seventeenth century, eighteenth century, nineteenth century, twentieth century, and non-continental French literature). There are author and subject indexes. Klapp has covered the critical literature comprehensively, and it may be earnestly hoped that his bibliography will have a long and prosperous existence.

Paul Lehmann, *Erforschung des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1959; 2 v., DM96.—), consists of selected essays by the noted Munich palaeographer. The first volume appeared in 1941 and has been reprinted by offset, but the second two volumes (the third to appear in mid-1960) are new publications. In the first volume, essays on the oldest book list in the Netherlands, the monastic library at Fulda, the cathedral library at Trèves, and source material for mediaeval library history are of special importance for the history of books and libraries. In the second volume there are essays on the monastic library at Beinwil (Switzerland) and on the cathedral libraries at Chur and Speyer. Throughout the two volumes there are constant reflections of Lehmann's abiding interest in the *fata libellorum*. The selections in the three volumes commemorate Professor Lehmann's seventy-fifth birthday on 13 July 1959.

A. N. L. Munby, in his *Cambridge College Libraries—Aids for Research Students* (Cambridge, W. Heffer, 1959; 70 pp., 8*s*6*d*), lists twenty-five Cambridge libraries, other than the University Library, giving essential information for those who wish to locate special material. The name of the responsible official is given, in each case, as are the hours the library is open, a description of the housing of the collections, and descriptions of manuscripts and of book resources. Archives are noted, as are the names of those who answer inquiries about them. The subject-index is especially useful, and in this carefully prepared and neatly produced handbook the scholar can find a wealth of helpful information which is nowhere else assembled. It may well prove that the book will increase the visitors to Cambridge by a considerable number—and that fellow-librarians in Cambridge will live to curse the day they gave Mr. Munby the information he prints in this little volume!

A. S. Zernova's *Knigi kirillovskoĭ pechati izdannye v Moskve v XVI-XVII vekakh* (Moscow, Lenin Library, 1958) is a basic bibliography of early Moscow imprints of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There are 498 entries, from

the anonymous printer of the *Evangelie* of 1555 to 1700. For each entry there is the title, date of publication, name of the Czar and the Patriarch under whom it was published, format, number of leaves or pages, number of lines per page, size of type, margins, engravings, variants, and special features. There are references to bibliographies and location symbols for two Leningrad libraries (Academy of Sciences and Public Library) and four Moscow libraries (Lenin, Historical Museum, Public Historical Library, Central State Archives). There are also entries for three Moscow imprints not found in the U.S.S.R. and five works printed outside of Moscow. It is of some significance that 441 of the 498 entries are located in the Lenin Library.

Short Fiction Criticism, a Checklist of Interpretation since 1925 of Stories and Novelettes (American, British, Continental), 1800-1958 (Denver, Alan Swallow, 1960; 265 pp.) by Jarvis Thurston, O. B. Emerson, Carl Hartman, and Elizabeth V. Wright deals with criticism in English of stories and novelettes of no more than about 150 pages. The compilers searched the files of some two hundred serials and hundreds of books for critical material on major authors, and their bibliography of sources occupies fifty-seven pages. While a work of this sort can make no pretense to absolute completeness, the compilers express the hope that "users will not too readily discover significant entries that we have overlooked." Over 150 authors from the U.S.S.R. to the U.S.A. are included. There is, unfortunately, no index of critics.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

JACOB BLANCK is a member of the Advisory Committee of *PBSA*.

R. H. BOWERS is Professor of English at The University of Florida.

MATTHEW J. BRUCCOLI assists Jacob Blanck in editing *BAL*.

DONALD F. CAMERON is in charge of the rare book collections of Rutgers University.

JOSEPH FUCILLA is Professor of Romance Languages at Northwestern University.

PAUL KAUFMAN is Consultant in Bibliography at The University of Washington.

PHILIP A. KNACHEL is a member of the staff of The Folger Shakespeare Library.

LEWIS LEARY is Professor of English at Columbia University.

JACOB LEED is Instructor in English at Northwestern University.

SCOTT C. OSBORN is Assistant Professor of English at Mississippi State University.

WILLIAM A. RINGLER, JR., is Professor of English at Washington University.

RICHARD H. SCHIMMELPFENG is Chief of the Catalog Department, Washington University Libraries.

VICTOR SCHOLDERER, of the British Museum, is the *doyen* of present-day incunabulists.

THOMAS B. STROUP is Professor of English at The University of Kentucky.

LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON, Librarian of The University of Kentucky Libraries, is book review editor of *PBSA*.

LESTER G. WELLS is Rare Book Librarian at Syracuse University.

WILLIAM WHITE is Professor of Journalism at Wayne State University.

FRANKLIN B. WILLIAMS, JR., is Associate Professor of English at Georgetown University.